This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

White: Manuscripts of Aristophanes

WIDENER LIBRARY
HX JTSQ N
GBL 10
3513
51

Ga110.953.5

Corridor

Harvard College
Library

FROM THE LIBRARY OF

HERBERT WEIR SMYTH

Class of 1878

Eliot Professor of Greek Literature

GIVEN IN HIS MEMORY
BY HIS FAMILY
1937

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

C. D. Gulick.

The Manuscripts of Aristophanes

By JOHN WILLIAMS WHITE

Reprinted from
ASSICAL PHILOLOGY, Vol. I, Nos. 1 and 3, January and July, 1906

PUBLISHED BY
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS, CHICAGO
Foreign Agents: *London*: DAVID NUTT; *Leipsig*: OTTO HARRASSOWITZ

Digitized by Google

Ga 110.953.5

HARVARD UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE DEPARTMENT
LIBRARY OF
APRIL 15, 1941

Digitized by Google

Charles B. Gulick,
with the faithful regards
of J. H. W.
1906

Classical Philology

Vol. I *January, 1906* No. 1

THE MANUSCRIPTS OF ARISTOPHANES. I

By John Williams White

The extant manuscripts of Aristophanes number about two hundred and forty. I append a list of these arranged in alphabetical order according to countries and cities. This list is very nearly complete.

But what constitutes a manuscript? The libraries catalogue all they possess, even those written in the eighteenth century, with religious care. The printing-press, however, establishes a limit. The first edition of Aristophanes was published at the end of the fifteenth century, nearly fifty years after the invention of the art of printing. Editions of the comic poet thereafter multiplied rapidly; twelve that were 'complete' were published in the next century. But it would be a mistake on this account to reject all manuscripts written after 1498; for many that are serviceable in establishing the text of the author and are demonstrably free from contamination with printed books belong to the sixteenth century.[1] Those written in the next two centuries must establish their claims to consideration or be cast out. The public library in Upsala possesses a 'manuscript' of Aristophanes of the seventeenth century that contains seven comedies.[2] An announcement of any new manuscript that contained more than the three Byzan-

[1] Cod. Parisini 2715 and 2717 have played an important rôle in establishing the text of Aristophanes.

[2] *Archives des missions scientifiques et littéraires*, 3e serie, tome XV (1889), p. 351.

Digitized by Google

tine plays would at once waken interest; but this book proved to be a copy of part of the edition issued at Basle in 1547. The Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris has two manuscripts of the *Equites;*[1] both are dated 1602, and both are in the handwriting of Isaac Casaubon. Some scholar must examine the text and determine its source, if possible. Any real manuscript of the *Equites* would have value. But by 1602 the play was in print in many editions, and Casaubon, a bookish man and a prolific maker of books, may have copied or constituted the text from printed sources. Just this happened a century and a half later. The same great library has six eighteenth-century manuscripts of Aristophanes that once belonged to Brunck.[2] I examined two of these[3] in the summer of 1904. An hour's inspection determined their value. These manuscripts, as the library names them, contain readings that are found in no earlier manuscript, but are due to the conjectures of Dawes[4] and other scholars. Presumably, therefore, the other four "Manuscrits de Brunck" also are simply the texts that he prepared for his own or the printer's use. They are not manuscripts. The same caution must be used in dealing with late manuscripts elsewhere; all the great libraries possess them. In the Biblioteca Vallicelliana in Rome many 'manuscripts' are preserved that were written either by Allacci himself or by his order. Among these are two that contain parts relating to Aristophanes;[5] one of these parts consists solely of scholia on the *Nubes*. What is their source? That remains to be determined, if anybody thinks the task worth while, but it is certain that Allacci had access to the Princeps of Aristophanes, which contains a remarkably full and good collection of scholia on nine

[1] Cod. Latini 8181 and 8451. Both were annotated by Casaubon. I conjecture that these are part of the sources on which Küster depended in his variorum edition. Cf. the end of the preface of his book: "Has autem Notas, quae antea in Bibliotheca Regia Parisiensi, incredibili optimorum cujusvis generis librorum copia instructa, latebant, suis sumptibus et Autographo describi curavit, Lutetiaque ad me misit, Vir Illustris Nicolaus Franciscus Remondus, clarus inter Gallos," etc.

[2] Supplement 347, 354–58.

[3] Supplement 356, containing the *Vespae*, *Pax*, *Aves*, and 358, containing the *Aves*, *Vespae*, *Pax*.

[4] The first edition of Dawes's *Miscellanea critica* was published in 1745.

[5] Cod. Allatiani 137 and 142.

Digitized by Google

plays, including the *Nubes*. Furthermore, by 1607 three other editions of these nine plays with scholia had been published. Allacci died in 1669, and was not the man to refrain from appropriating without acknowledgment whatever he desired — although, in truth, this was the general practice of his time. He was that *biblioteoario* of the Vatican who brought the Heidelberg manuscripts to Rome, a rank plunderer. Bentley characterized him as "malevolentia et livor, non homo"! Among the books in the Biblioteca Ottoboniana, now in the Vatican, there is a manuscript that wakened interest when it was announced in 1892, because, as it was supposed, it contained nine plays and was of the sixteenth century.[1] Nine titles, in fact, stand on the recto of the first folio. Only three manuscripts, the Codex Ravennas not included, are extant that contain nine plays. Another genuine manuscript that contained nine plays might be an important addition to our resources, but the book proved to be a disappointment. It contains the *Plutus* of Aristophanes ("Ἀριστοφάνους Πλοῦτος κωμῳδῆα"), the *Medea* and fifteen verses of the *Hippolytus* of Euripides, the *Prometheus* of Aeschylus, and some other small matters. It is a schoolboy's book of the seventeenth century, with a feeble interlinear version in Latin.

Manuscripts, therefore, written in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries must be sharply examined before they are used. It is, of course, possible that they may have independent value, as copies of earlier manuscripts of good tradition that have been lost. A copy made even as late as 1650 of any of the manuscripts that were destroyed by fire in the Escurial Library in 1671 would now be worthy of inspection. If Isaac Vos's manuscript of the *Lysistrata*,[2] a fragment of a famous fourteenth century book, had gone to the bottom of the North Sea in the evil-sailing ship that carried Gerard Vos's great library out of England, Bentley's copy of it,[3] which has been widely used, would be a treasure, as indeed it is, because of its associations. This point may be illustrated in another manner. The second manu-

[1] Cod. Ottobonianus 307.

[2] Cod. Vossiani 77 and 191, now in Leyden.

[3] Now in Trinity College Library, Cambridge; Cod. 964 (R. 16. 36).

Digitized by Google

script of Aristophanes in point of age is now in St. Mark's Library.[1] It was written in the twelfth century in the workshop of some Byzantine monastery, and in the fifteenth century belonged to Cardinal Bessarion, who left it by will, with other valuable manuscripts,[2] to the republic of Venice. It is hard to read, and Bessarion, although he was a Greek, found it slow work to extract from it the tripping jests of Aristophanes.[3] He therefore had it copied by one of his table companions. The copy is beautifully executed on vellum and reads like print.[4] It is demonstrable, I think, that the copyist had only the older manuscript before him when at work; his copy shows no trace of the influence of other manuscripts, and is faithful, as copies go. At present this fifteenth-century manuscript has only inferior value, but if its twelfth-century original had been destroyed at any time before 1902, when it was reproduced in facsimile, the copy would at once have become priceless.

All the manuscripts that date from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries will, without doubt, be examined in due time, and their value estimated. Meanwhile I have thought it proper to include them in the list. Their subsequent exclusion, if they prove to be valueless, will not be difficult. They are relatively few in number—twenty-six. To these I add sixteen others whose dates have not yet been determined.[5]

There remain one hundred and ninety-five. Two of these, fragments of the *Aves*, belong respectively to the sixth[6] and tenth[7] centuries; all the rest can be assigned, with greater or less confidence, to one of the six centuries from the eleventh to the

[1] Cod. Venetus 474.

[2] See Omont, *Inventaire des Mss. donnés à Saint-Marc de Venise par le Cardinal Bessarion.*

[3] It speaks well for many fathers of the church, including St. Chrysostom, that they have found solace in our poet.

[4] It is clear from internal evidence that some toilers in St. Mark's Library have shirked the harder book and collated this in its stead.

[5] The correctness of the dating of some of the manuscripts in the list is not certain; the age of these must finally be determined by experts.

[6] A parchment fragment, now in the Musée du Louvre.

[7] A parchment palimpsest fragment, forming part of Cod. Laurentianus LX. 9, in Florence.

Digitized by Google

sixteenth inclusive. One hundred and seventy of these contain the text or part of the text of the plays, and about one hundred of this number contain also scholia. I have placed the remainder under the heading "Supplementary." These contain only extracts, variously designated as sententiae (γνῶμαι) or florilegia, or only scholia, or only arguments.

Interest naturally centers in the one hundred and seventy that furnish the text of the plays. I give a few statistics.

MANUSCRIPTS COUNTED WITH REFERENCE TO THEIR AGE[1]

Century	6th	10th	11th	12th	13th	14th	15th	16th
No. of MSS.	1	1	1	1	4	25½	88	48½

WITH REFERENCE TO NUMBER OF PLAYS OR PARTS OF PLAYS CONTAINED[2]

No. of Plays	11	9	8	7	6	4	3	2	1
No. of MSS	1	3	1	4	3	14	47	58	40

WITH REFERENCE TO NUMBER OF TIMES EACH PLAY OCCURS[3]

Plays	*Plut.*	*Nub.*	*Ran.*	*Eq.*	*Av.*	*Ach.*	*Vesp.*	*Pax*	*Lys.*	*Ec.*	*Thesm.*
No. of MSS.	148	127	76	28	18	14	10	8	8	7	2

Other manuscripts of Aristophanes than those named in the list given below are known once to have been extant. There is authentic record that some have been destroyed by fire. Valuable manuscripts in the Escurial were lost in this way in 1671. Cod. X I 16, now in that library, is a catalogue of its Greek manuscripts, made by Nicolas de la Torre before the fire. It records six manuscripts of Aristophanes, some of which were lost irretrievably.[3] The great disaster in Turin is more recent. That

[1] If a manuscript, the age of which is doubtful, is dated in two centuries in the list, the later is taken in this count. But note that two manuscripts, Cod. 2626 in Cambridge and Cod. Riccardianus 48 in Florence, each belong, part in one century, part in another.

[2] Cod. 113 in Ferrara is counted double.

[3] Graux, in his *Essai sur l'origine du fonds grec de l'Escurial* (1880), identifies two of these with Υ III 16 and Ω IV 7, manuscripts now extant. But Miller, in his *Catalogue des Mss. grecs de la bibliothèque de l'Escurial* (1848), identifies Φ III 16, and only that.

Digitized by Google

library contained three manuscripts of Aristophanes; one of these was of unusual interest.[1] I wrote to the librarian, Signor Carta, from Rome about it shortly after the fire, and he replied that nothing was left—"neppure un frammento." The utmost effort has been made to preserve and restore the fragments of the manuscripts that were rescued, and a provisional account of the result has been published.[2] Remains of two of the manuscripts that contained Aristophanes have been saved.[3] I have thought it proper to include the Turin books in the list.

Other manuscripts of our poet would seem naturally to fall under the caption "Strayed, Lost, or Stolen"—and "Found"! They begin to go astray early. The editor of the *Thesmophoriazusae* and *Lysistrata* in the first Juntine edition announced with pride his use of a certain "Codex Urbinas." Modern editors made vain search for this manuscript, and in default of the original quoted the printed book. It was not till 1871 that W. G. Clark[4] and A. von Velsen[5] independently demonstrated that this "Urbinas" was the celebrated Cod. Ravennas. The identification is certain. Küster's manuscripts have been identified, with perhaps the exception of his "Cod. Bodleianus." The early editors designated their manuscripts in a vague, happy-go-lucky manner, to the extreme vexation of their successors. The record for exasperating unintelligibleness is held by Ernesti. Even the acute Hermann, though a German, identified only one of his manuscripts, although he re-edited Ernesti's collations within a short time after his death. Some of them, especially two "Iesuit. Paris.," still wander like lost ghosts to torment the living. The most celebrated case is perhaps "Brunck's Aristophanes." In his edition he calls this "codex meus" and gives it the symbol D. It has been largely quoted, but even in the latest editions always from Brunck's own collations; and Dobree's suggestion that, on

[1] Cod. B V 34. Both Professor Zacher and Professor Zuretti have made use of this manuscript, and will publish, it is to be hoped, whatever collations they have of its important scholia.

[2] *Rivista di filologia* XXXII (1904), pp. 385 ff. [3] *Rivista*, pp. 419, 427.

[4] *Journal of Philology* III, pp. 153 ff.

[5] *Ueber den Codex Urbinas der Lysistrata und der Thesmophoriazusen des Aristophanes* (Halle).

Digitized by Google

Brunck's death, it came into the possession of Richard Heber, when all trace of it was lost, has been often repeated. But it was purchased in Rotterdam by George Butler, afterwards Head Master of Harrow and Dean of Peterborough, and in 1876 was presented by H. Montagu Butler, Master of Trinity, to Trinity College Library.[1]

Hardly less famous are Bekker's "Mutinenses." There were three of these, which he collated in Paris.[2] His readings from them have been often quoted, but the manuscripts disappeared from Paris and from the ken of scholars. Beyond doubt, they were sent back to Italy with other spoil which the first Napoleon had swept away. W. G. Clark, in 1869, acutely suggested that Bekker's "M" was identical with the single manuscript of Aristophanes now preserved in the Biblioteca Capitolare in Verona.[3] Some other manuscripts have not yet been identified.[4]

It will be apparent from the account that is to follow of the recorded use of these manuscripts by scholars since the end of the fifteenth century that, while the oldest books have often been collated and some others diligently studied, many fourteenth- and fifteenth-century manuscripts have never even been examined. The choice of the manuscripts that have been used seems often to have been due to environment[5] or even chance.

Cobet's contemptuous opinion of the manuscripts of Aris-

[1] Cod. R. I. 42. See Montague James Rhodes, *The Western Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge*, II (1901), pp. 11 f. This manuscript was once in the possession of Porson, towards the end of his life, but he seems not to have made use of it. W. G. Clark made notes from it while it was still in possession of the Dean of Peterborough. These notes are preserved in the library of Trinity College.—On the third folio is written: "Sum Beati Rhenani. Nec muto dominum"!

[2] "Mutinenses autem Parisiis vocabantur quotquot ex Italia superiore allati erant." Bekker's *Aristophanes* I, Praefatio, p. vi.

[3] *Journal of Philology* II, p. 312. Clark does not state his reasons, but among them, doubtless, was the fact that the Verona manuscript carries not only the stamp of the Bibliothèque Royale in Paris, but also the coat of arms of the Estensi. See Omont in *Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* VIII (1891), pp. 489 ff. A manuscript, precisely answering to the Verona manuscript, was lost from the Biblioteca Estense early in the nineteenth century. This is described in Gabardi's written Catalogue I, p. 274. See *Studi italiani* IV (1896), p. 440. Clark's conjecture could easily be verified by anybody in Verona.

[4] The manuscript numbered 3436 in Bernard's "Catalogi;" Invernizi's "Cod. Borgianus," now perhaps in the Vatican, and a few others.

[5] If the immense Vatican collections had been in Germany during the past two hundred years, we should know more about them.

Digitized by Google

tophanes[1] has now less weight than when the master first pronounced it. The study of the papyri has rudely shaken the authority of the whole race of diviners, and is gradually establishing belief in the trustworthiness of the traditional text furnished by mediaeval manuscripts. We have a bit of similar evidence for Aristophanes. The oldest extant source of any part of his text is the vellum fragment, found in the Fayûm and now in the Louvre, mentioned above.[2] It contains fifty-six verses of the *Aves*, with scholia, and is of capital significance in the respect now under consideration. It is five hundred years older than the Cod. Ravennas, but its text shows no important discrepancies from that of the extant manuscripts of the *Aves*. It therefore confirms the integrity of the tradition represented by these manuscripts. But the results of the study of the papyri have a wider application; they show that the 'inferior' manuscripts have an authority that heretofore has been denied them.[3] I quote the recent statement of a recognized authority:

> The favourite method of modern scholarship, and one by which much has been gained in textual criticism, has been to endeavour to trace the relationships of the various manuscripts of an author, to divide them into families, to determine which manuscript or family represents the best tradition, and then to follow this evidence of the family or manuscript in almost all cases of doubt. But the papyri have shown us decisively in some cases, and allow us to argue by analogy to others, that these family divisions are of relatively late origin, and that the better MSS. have no sort of monopoly of ancient and correct readings. In future . . . . the critical editor . . . . will have to be prepared to find the truth not unfrequently among the witnesses who usually are inferior, and to exercise a freer judgment in deciding between them.[4]

The study of the later manuscripts of Aristophanes, especially of those which are not yet known, assumes a new importance.

(*To be continued*)

[1] *Novae lectiones*, pp. 253 ff. Cobet himself, in his youth, collated the Cod. Venetus: "quem ipse olim cum pulvisculo excussi"! This collation is now preserved in the University Library in Leyden.

[2] Weil, *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions* (1884), pp. 723 ff., and *Revue de philologie* VI (1882), pp. 179 ff.

[3] Cobet could say, in speaking of the Ravennas and Venetus: "habentur pro optimis, quia caeteri omnes sunt etiam multo peiores nequioresque."

[4] F. G. Kenyon on "The Evidence of Greek Papyri with Regard to Textual Criticism," in the *Proceedings of the British Academy* I (1904).

Digitized by Google

THE MANUSCRIPTS OF ARISTOPHANES. II

By John Williams White

In this article two topics will receive such discussion as is possible within brief limits: the critical use of the manuscripts of Aristophanes to the middle of the nineteenth century, and the employment of symbols to designate them.

Investigation has not yet disclosed the particular manuscripts that Musurus used in constituting the text of the Princeps, published by Aldus in Venice in 1498. They may no longer be extant, except perhaps as bindings in Aldine editions. At the end of the *Aves* Musurus speaks of "divers copies" from which he compiled the scholia.[1] In his dedication of the book, Aldus says he omits a tenth play, the *Lysistrata*, "quia vix dimidiata haberi a nobis potuit."

The range of the investigation of the source of the Princeps is gradually narrowing as the contents of the manuscripts become better known, and it seems not improbable that in time we shall be able to determine, if not the immediate source of this important book, at least the branch to which it belongs in the stemma of existing manuscripts.[2]

The second edition of Aristophanes, published in Florence in 1515, is a reprint of the text of the Aldine, but the text was

[1] *Ἀριστοφάνους κωμῳδιῶν ἑπτὰ καὶ τῶν εἰς αὐτὰς σχολίων ἀρχαίοις συντεθέντων γραμματικοῖς, ἃ δὴ σποράδην ἐν ἀντιγράφοις κείμενα διαφόροις καὶ πεφυρμένοις συνελεκταί τε καὶ ὡς οἷόν τ' ἦν ἐπιμελέστατα διώρθωται παρὰ Μάρκου Μουσούρου τοῦ Κρητός, τέλος.* The seven plays were the *Plutus*, *Nubes*, *Ranae*, *Equites*, *Acharnenses*, *Vespae*, *Aves*. The original intention of Aldus, without doubt, was to end the book with the *Aves*, but subsequently he added the *Pax* and *Ecclesiazusae*.

[2] W. Dindorf, in the preface to his *Acharnenses* (1828), says of the Princeps: "ex uno eoque non optimo libro facta esse videtur." In his Oxford edition of Aristophanes (III. xvi), published in 1837, his view has shifted: "ex uno pluribusve infimae aetatis codicibus esse compositam vitiorum multitudo ostendit." Zuretti, in his *Analecta Aristophanea* (1892), pp. 35–84, maintains that Cod. Estensis III D 8, which once belonged to Musurus, is virtually the sole source of the text of the Aldine Aristophanes for the six plays which the manuscript contains, and that this manuscript and Cod. Ambrosianus L 41 are the chief sources of its scholia. See Zacher, who dissents, in Bursian's *Jahresbericht* LXXI (1892), pp. 30 ff.

Digitized by Google

revised,[1] and the editor, Bernardo Giunta, seems to have had the help of manuscripts.[2] It contains the same plays as the Aldine book, but without scholia. Four months later the same house issued, as an appendix, two plays not previously published, the *Thesmophoriazusae* and the *Lysistrata*. In the dedication of this little book the editor says that they were obtained from a manuscript which contained also other plays of Aristophanes and belonged to the library in Urbino.[3] This was the Codex Ravennas.[4]

The third edition of Aristophanes was issued from the Juntine press in Florence in 1525, under the editorship of Francinus. This contains the nine plays in the Aldine edition, with scholia, in the order followed in that book, and gives for the first time verses 948–1011 of the *Pax*. Only eight manuscripts are extant which have this play, and five[5] of these do not contain the verses mentioned. If, therefore, they were secured for the edition of 1525 from a manuscript now extant, this must have been either the Ravennas or the Venetus.[6] Dindorf declared for the Ravennas.[7] A collation of the Ravennas and the Venetus with the text of these verses in the second Juntine book neither confirms his statement nor proves it to be erroneous.[8] The book, in fact, shows considerable variations from both manuscripts, which may be due to editorial revision. A collation, however, of the scholia

[1] The editor, speaking of the plays in the Aldine edition, says: "easdem hic quoque nos maxima diligentia recognitas summoque labore castigatas nostris typis meliores reddere conati sumus."

[2] Raper noted that entire verses, lacking in the Princeps, are found in the first Juntine: *Ran.* 515, *Ec.* 469, 470 (see Invernizi, III, p. xxxi). He remarks also other variations in text that certainly indicate the use of manuscripts. Dindorf thought that these were codices Laurentiani (ed. *Eccles.* iv; ed. Oxon. III. xvi).

[3] "Venit mi Francisce expectata dies illa in qua ex Urbinate bibliotheca antiquissimum Aristophanis exemplar nacti sumus ibique inter alias Ἀνσιστράτην καὶ Θεσμοφοριαζούσας .... non alias visas comedias invenimus."

[4] See *Classical Philology* I (1906), p. 6.

[5] Laurentianus XXXI. 15, Parisini 2715 and 2717, Havniensis 1980, and Palatinus 67.

[6] The eighth manuscript, Cod. Venetus 475 (G), is a copy of Cod. 474. See *Classical Philology* I (1906), pp. 3 f.

[7] Ed. Oxon. IV. iv.

[8] Elsewhere, however, the text seems to show close relation with the Ravennas. For example, in the first three hundred verses of the *Aves*, it agrees with the Ravennas solely against fourteen other manuscripts, the Princeps and Junta I as follows: 75 γ' ἄτ'; 164 πειθώμεσθ'; 177 τί δ'; 216 σμίλακος; 227 ἑτοιμοί· ποίπο· ποποποί· ποποί; 298 ἐπὶ τῶν λόφων.

Digitized by Google

in the Ravennas and the Venetus with those in the book is decisive. It not only contains none of the scholia which are found in the Venetus, but are not in the Ravennas—and these are numerous—but in case of differences between the manuscripts invariably follows the older. The scholia on 948–1011 in Junta II were derived either from the Ravennas or from a manuscript, not now extant, which was very closely related to it.

Nevertheless, it seems to me highly improbable that the Cod. Ravennas was in the hands of Francinus in 1525. In the dedication of the second Juntine edition the editor boasts of the perfection of his book and of its superiority to both the editions of the poet that preceded it. But it does not contain the *Thesmophoriazusae* nor the *Lysistrata*, although the text of both these plays had been published, under the editorship of B. Giunta, by the same house early in 1516 from the Cod. Ravennas. This manuscript contains scholia on each play, and it is hardly credible that Francinus would have neglected the opportunity to complete his book by adding these plays, adorned by the commentary that had never yet been published, if the press still had control of the manuscript. It had originally come into its possession by the interposition of Euphrosynus Boninus, who had obtained it from the library in Urbino. But he did not return it thither, and it is to be presumed that in 1525 it was safely in his possession in Pisa,[1] and that he declined again to relinquish it. He may have sent a copy of the missing verses of the *Pax*, with excerpts[2] from the scholia, or these may have been copied out in 1516 against a future edition.

The edition of 1525, however, does contain scholia that are not found in the Aldine edition. These occur in the notes on the *Plutus* and *Nubes*, but practically disappear in the plays that follow.[3] Furthermore, it was observed by Raper that vs. 132 of the *Ranae* occurs in the book, although it is in neither of the

[1] On Boninus as professor in Pisa, see Poccianti, *Catalogus Scriptorum Florentinorum*, p. 54.

[2] The following scholia in the Ravennas are omitted in the book: on 961, 967, 995, 1007, 1008 *bis*, 1009, 1011, and in part on 959, 968.

[3] They are specially marked by a symbol in Küster's edition. See also Dindorf, ed. Oxon. IV. ix.

Digitized by Google

preceding editions, and also that some variant readings occur that indicate the use of manuscript sources.[1]

Hemsterhuis[2] asserts that Francinus in the second Juntine edition depended on late, inferior manuscripts, whenever he departed from the Princeps. This adverse judgment is controverted by Reisig,[3] who blames Brunck for perpetuating it, and says that there is no more accurate edition of the *Vespae* and *Pax* than that of Francinus.[4]

Before 1525 a separate edition of the *Plutus* and *Ranae*, single editions of the *Plutus*, *Nubes*, and *Ranae*, and a Latin version of the *Plutus* (1501) had appeared. After 1525 both 'complete' editions of the poet and editions of single plays multiplied with great rapidity. But the books bred in, and the independent use of manuscripts must have been rare. The editors practically never make mention of *libri scripti*,[5] and are in general studiously

[1] See Invernizi, III, pp. xxxiii f.

[2] In his edition of the *Plutus*, p. xix.

[3] In his *Coniectanearum in Aristophanem libri duo* (1816), pp. xvi f.

[4] It is obvious that we are not yet adequately informed in regard to these earliest editions of Aristophanes, which in some particulars have the importance of manuscripts. It will be the task of some patient man to determine the facts by an investigation of the relation of the two Juntine editions to one another, to the Princeps, and to the Cod. Ravennas, which is now easily accessible in facsimile, and of both these editions also to the Florentine manuscripts. See Dindorf in the preface to his edition of the *Acharnenses* (1828).

[5] I have noted a few exceptions. Vettori wrote in the margin of his copy of the Princeps against vss. 1748–1754 of the *Aves:* "Sic distincta sunt haec carmina in vet. cod. ex bibliotheca Divi Marci, cum quo totam comoediam contulimus." See *Acta Phil. Mon.* I (1812), p. 402. I ventured the suggestion in 1902 (in the preface to *Facsimile of the Codex Venetus Marcianus 474*, p. 6, n. 1) that the manuscript to which Vettori refers was Venetus 474, but the investigations of my colleague, Dr. Cary, show intimate relationship in the *Aves* between Vettori's notes and Laurentianus XXXI. 15 (Γ). It remains to be determined whether Laurentianus XXXI. 15 was ever in the library of S. Marco in Florence.—Frédéric Morel published in Paris in 1586 an edition of the *Pax* "cum emendationibus et variis lectionibus e codice manuscripto in bibliotheca reginae matris" (Catharine de' Medici). This book I have not seen.—Chrestien also made sparing use of Paris manuscripts in his edition of the *Pax* (1589). He has recorded his difficulties and reflexions: "Nullum ex his verbis [*οὐκ ἐᾷς τῶν ξύλων Pax* 1133] bonum sensum venari possum, cumque diutius me torsisset hic locus, conquisivi quae potui exemplaria manu scripta. Atque adeo cum aditus mihi patuisset in Bibliothecam Mediceam, quae Parisiis est, quamque sub Reginae matris praestantissimae heroinae auspiciis et stipendiis diligenti custodia tanquam vigil draco mala aurea tuetur et servat vir doctus Bellebranchaeus Antistes, incidi in exemplaria vetusta duo; sed incertior inde discessi, quam eram. Nam lectionem hanc deprehendi *οὐκ ἴδεσω*, nostra adhuc pejorem. Scio manuscriptos libros magnum adferre has

Digitized by Google

silent as to their printed sources. Almost all the early books neglect to acknowledge their forbears.

The critical use of manuscripts which the editor names with such definiteness that in general they can now be identified begins with Küster in his monumental variorum edition published in 1710. Zacagni, at this time librarian of the Vatican, furnished him with collations of the *Plutus*, *Nubes*, *Ranae*, and *Aves* in Cod. Urbinas 141[1] and of the *Equites*, *Acharnenses*, *Vespae*, *Pax*, and *Lysistrata* in Cod. Palatinus 67.[2] He had at his command also collations of the *Plutus* in a Cod. Bodleianus, which Dobree thought might be the Lincolniensis in Oxford, of the *Plutus* and *Nubes* in the Arundelianus now in the British Museum, and of the *Lysistrata* in an apograph of Vossianus 77 now in Leyden. This apograph, which enabled him to print the scholia on the *Lysistrata* for the first time, was sent to him from Cambridge by Bentley and is now in the library of Trinity College. Küster mentions the use also of a "Baroccianus" in constituting the text of the scholia on the *Lysistrata*. He probably refers to the scholia in Bentley's apograph extracted from Baroccianus 38 to supply the omissions in Vossianus 77.[3] Excerpts also of scholia from Vaticanus 1294 and Urbinas 141 were sent to Küster from Rome and enabled him to state the important fact that many of the Aldine

litteras tractantibus auxilium, sed profecto saepe accidit, ut falsas lectiones et corruptas quas habent plerunque vetuste scripti codices amplectantur qui judicio pravo parvoque lectionis usu praediti accedunt ad veteres illas tabulas et quasi litterarum naufragia." He finally proposes *οὐκεαστῶν* for *οὐκ ἐᾷς τῶν*, and thinks well of his emendation.

[1] Küster says simply "Ms. Vaticano-Urbinas," but the only other Urbinas in the Vatican collection that comprises plays of Aristophanes does not contain the *Aves*.

[2] Küster says simply "Ms. Vaticano-Palatinus," but Cod. 67 is the only Palatinus of Aristophanes that contains the five plays he names. Of this Vaticanus Dobree said in 1820: "Contulit Zacagnius in usum Kusteri, qui praeter lectiones in editis notis memoratas, quaedam notavit in margine editionis Porti. Liber in Hemsterhusii potestatem venit (vide eum ad Plut. p. 482) et nunc est in bibliotheca Leidensi." By "liber" Dobree meant the annotated edition of Portus, as reference to Hemsterhuis makes clear, but Dobree's note has been the source of an error which needs correction. Both Thiersch (ed. of the *Plutus*, p. xxxvi) and Teuffel (second ed. of the *Nubes*, p. 24) state that the *manuscript* is in the library in Leyden.

[3] Küster did *not* use Vos's manuscript but an apograph. See Dobree's note on *Lysistrata* 200, in *Porsoni Notas*, p. 226, and in the Addenda, p. (148). See also, on the various Leyden 'Lysistratas,' G. Stein, *Scholia in Aristophanis Lysistratam*, pp. xxxff. —Bentley, it seems, used also Baroccianus 127. See *Classical Journal* XII, p. 104.

Digitized by Google

scholia were not 'old' but were due to Thomas Magister and John Tzetzes.[1]

In 1744 Hemsterhuis published his edition of the *Plutus*, in which he first made use of the D'Orvillianus now in Oxford and of Leidensis 34.[2] In the second edition of this important book (1811), the editor, Schaefer, prints extracts from Parisinus 2827 which had been made for him by Bast.

J. G. Trendelenburg published in 1780[3] readings of the *Plutus* from the Elbingensis, a manuscript of which Harles also subsequently made use through Trendelenburg's good offices.

Thomas Burgess, in his edition of the *Miscellanea Critica* of Dawes issued in 1781, published variants of Barocciani 43 and 127 on passages dealt with by Dawes. Burgess recorded the lacunae in Cod. 43.

Richard Brunck of Strassburg first made systematic use of manuscripts housed in the Bibliothèque Royale in Paris in his celebrated edition of Aristophanes issued in 1781–83. These manuscripts were Cod. Regii 2712, 2715, 2717, a "Regius Bombycinus," which had not been given a regular number in the printed catalogue of 1740, but was almost certainly Supplement 135,[4] and Regius 2820, which he used for supplementary emendation on the *Plutus*, *Nubes*, and *Ranae*. Besides these Brunck used another bombycine manuscript which he designates as "Codex Meus" and gives the symbol D,[5] and, in editing the *Lysistrata* and *Thesmophoriazusae*, an "Augustanus" (Cod. Monacensis 492[6]).

[1] See Küster's Praefatio, p. ii, and Zacher, *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie*, Supplem. XVI (1888), pp. 561 f. Also, on the Tzetzian scholia on the *Aves* in Urbinas 141, White, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* XII (1901), pp. 69 ff.

[2] See his edition, pp. xvi and 381.

[3] In *Bibliotheca philologica et critica*, Göttingen, I (1780), pp. 25 ff.

[4] Brunck says (at the beginning of his notes on the Plutus): "Initio Codicis C. interierunt folia aliquot, quibus continebantur praeter argumentum versus fabulae 68. primi, et scholia in 65. horum priores." Cf. with this Omont's description of Supplement 135 (*Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque Nationale* III, p. 221). The identification, which was assumed by Bothe in his edition of the *Ranae* (1828), p. iii, still lacks final confirmation.

[5] See *Classical Philology* I (1906), pp. 6 f.

[6] 492, not 192. This manuscript is a transcript of the Ravennas. See Enger, *Rheinisches Museum*, N. F. II, p. 245, whose statement is confirmed by W. G. Clark, *Journal of Philology* III, p. 160, and von Velsen, *Ueber den Codex Urbinas der Lysistrata und der Thesmophoriazusen*, p. 7.

Digitized by Google

In his edition of the *Nubes* published in 1788, Harles, the editor of the *Bibliotheca Graeca* of Fabricius, used a Cod. Bavaricus (Monacensis 137), from which collations of the *Nubes* and *Ranae* were made for him by Ammon. Trendelenburg also furnished him readings of both the *Nubes* and the *Ranae* from the Elbingensis. The collations of the *Ranae* from these two manuscripts are published in an appendix.[1] Harles includes in his book also an argument of the *Nubes*[2] found in Cod. Matritensis 67. This he extracted from Iriarte's catalogue. He states, furthermore, that Matthaei had sent to him readings of the *Plutus* from a Cod. Moscouiensis, but no use of them can be traced.

The ponderous edition of Aristophanes planned by Invernizi began to appear in 1794. He has the distinction of being the first modern scholar to make use of the Ravennas. The manuscript had been seen by D'Orville at Ravenna in 1728, but he simply catalogued it.[3] Invernizi, by the liberality of Cardinal Stefano Borgia, had command also of a Cod. Borgianus.[4] This manuscript was sent to him from the Museum Veliternum, and it furnished him readings of the *Plutus*, *Nubes*,[5] and *Ranae*.

J. A. Ernesti had contributed a preface on the scholia to the edition of the *Nubes* that was reprinted from Küster's edition at Leipzig in 1753. Ernesti then began to collect materials for a new edition and collated manuscripts. His notes on the *Nubes* were published after his death[6] and furnished a basis for G. Hermann's two editions of the play. Ernesti himself described the manuscripts he had consulted in these words: "Sub signo R. adscripta est varietas Codicis Regii collati cum exemplo Basileensi Frobenii. Igitur interdum, ubi illa lectio iam est in textu Kust. adscripsi: *Sic Kust.* Vbi nihil diversitatis notatum est, consentit cum Basil. —L. est Cod. Leidensis. C. Coislianus, nunc regius. Ia. Iesuit. Paris. primus. Ib. Ies. Paris. secundus. I. Cod. Ies. uterque." This is a vague and meager description, but Ernesti's readings

[1] Pp. 232-244.

[2] IX in Dindorf and Dübner.

[3] See T. W. Allen in *The Academy* XXXVI (1889), p. 59, and *Journal of Philology* XXIV (1896), p. 324.

[4] See *Classical Philology* I (1906), p. 7, n. 4.

[5] *Nubes*, not *Aves*, as by a slip of the pen Invernizi says in his preface, p. xiii.

[6] Io. Aug. Ernesti *Observationes philologico-criticae in Aristophanis Nubes*, 1795.

Digitized by Google

from these manuscripts have often been quoted. Hermann, in his first edition of the *Nubes* (1799), identified Ernesti's "Regius" with Brunck's A (Cod. Parisinus 2712). Dobree concluded that Ernesti's "Leidensis" was the same manuscript (Leidensis 34) that Hemsterhuis had used in editing the *Plutus*.[1] Ernesti's "Coislianus, nunc regius" von Sinner[2] would identify with Cod. Coislinianus 354,[3] as also the "Iesuit. Paris. primus" with Parisinus Supplem. 97.[4]

F. A. Wolf, in the preface[5] to his translation of the *Nubes* which appeared in 1811, states that he had collated in Vienna and Munich six good manuscripts of which no use had previously been made, but was not able to avail himself largely of their readings.

Reisig in his often quoted *Coniectaneorum in Aristophanem libri duo* (1816) acknowledges his obligations to Thiersch for readings of the *Ecclesiazusae* and *Nubes* that A. Nickel had excerpted from a manuscript in Munich.[6] Seidler also had furnished him readings "ex suis MSS." One of these was a Venetus.[7] In his edition of the *Nubes* (1820) Reisig made independent use of the D'Orvillianus previously employed by Hemsterhuis.

W. Dindorf made the first of his important and long-continued contributions to the study of Aristophanes, at the age of eighteen, with his edition of the *Pax* published at Leipzig in 1820.[8] He also was indebted to Seidler for readings of the *Pax* from Venetus 474.

In 1820 appeared Porson's *Notae in Aristophanem*, edited by Dobree. This book was a noteworthy addition to the resources of students of the comic poet, both in respect to the number of

[1] *Porsoni Notae in Aristophanem*, p. viii.

[2] *Aristophanis Nubes* (1834), p. xi.

[3] It is to be noted that this is the only manuscript in the Coislin collection that contains plays of Aristophanes.

[4] This manuscript belonged originally to the Collège des Jésuites de Clermont. On the suppression of the order of the Jesuits the manuscripts of the Collège were purchased *en bloc* by Gérard Meermann, in 1764, and left France; but certain manuscripts in the collection were presented by Meermann to the King, among others this book.

[5] P. xvii.

[6] See Reisig, p. v. The manuscript was Monacensis 137. Harles had previously published its readings of the *Nubes* and *Ranae* as has been stated on the preceding page.

[7] See Reisig, p. xviii.

[8] The same year the seventh volume of the Invernizi edition appeared under Dindorf's editorship.

Digitized by Google

manuscripts whose readings it furnished for the first time and in its critical accuracy. Porson had collated Harleianus 5664 and Baroccianus 34, and had made independent use of Barocciani 43 and 127, the D'Orvillianus and Bentley's copy of Vossianus 77. Dobree's contribution was noteworthy: the manuscripts in the library of the University of Cambridge (2626, 2614, 2627), Harleiani 5725 and 6307, and for the *Aves* Vossianus 191, now in Leyden. He used also readings of Monacensis 137 which Thiersch had sent to him, in editiug the *Ecclesiazusae*, and inspected the Arundelianus afresh.[1]

Cod. Havniensis 1980 was first used by W. Dindorf in his edition of the *Aves* (1822). A collation of this play, made by Bloch, is given in the preface, but it has been neglected by subsequent editors. In his *Ecclesiazusae* (1826), he published readings of Laurentianus XXXI. 15 (Γ),[2] which were sent to him by del Furia, and in his *Acharnenses* (1828) he had at command collations both of this manuscript and of Laurentianus XXXI. 16 (Δ). In his text edition of the eleven plays published in 1830 he added Laurentianus 2779 (Θ).

I. Bekker, in the course of his unwearied but hurried investigations in the libraries of southern Europe, twice collated Venetus 474, in Paris in 1812 and again in Venice in 1819. He seems to have made over his collations both of this manuscript and of the Ravennas to Seidler, who intended to publish them. Seidler's book never appeared, but he put the material at the command of other scholars, Reisig, Dindorf,[3] G. Hermann, and Fritzsche. Dindorf published readings of the Venetus not only in his edition of the *Pax* but also, though few in number, in his *Aves* (1822) and *Ranae* (1824). Hermann in 1830 acknowledged his indebt-

[1] Since brief mention of the first use of *libri manuscripti* alone is here intended, mention is purposely omitted of certain early editions of Aristophanes to which Porson and Dobree had access, with marginal readings whose provenance is not always certain, although presumably they were copied from manuscripts. Many such books are preserved, especially in the libraries of northern Europe.

[2] Two years earlier, in his *Ranae* (1824), Dindorf gives readings of "Florentinus b" on the first one hundred and eight verses, but fails to designate the book so that it can be identified. In his preface he intimates his knowledge of "Libri Florentini octo," and adds "De his propediem alio loco agetur."

[3] See the preceding page.

Digitized by Google

edness to Seidler for readings from both the Venetus and the Ravennas,[1] as likewise Fritzsche in 1837.[2] Bekker had inspected also Venetus 475 (G) and in 1818 had collated the Ravennas anew, convinced that the collations used by Invernizi were not to be trusted. In Paris he had collated also, for the *Plutus*, *Nubes*, and *Ranae*, certain "Codices Mutinenses," which had been brought thither from northern Italy.[3] All this material appeared in his edition of Aristophanes published in London in 1829. He had given attention not only to the text of the play but also to the ancient commentary and was the first to publish the old scholia on the *Thesmophoriazusae*, and from Venetus 474 he recast the scholia on the *Vespae* and *Pax*.

In 1829 Tafel published readings of the Tubingensis in the fourth volume of Seebode's *Neues Archiv für Philologie und Pädagogik*, and those on the *Plutus* are reprinted by Thiersch in his edition of this play,[4] which appeared in 1830. In this book Thiersch first published readings of the *Plutus* in Monacensis 137. He states that he had been informed by Ernest Hecht, just as his book was going through the press, that recently, while on his travels in Italy, he had seen five "Codices Ambrosiani" in Milan, and adds: "Quum vero codices Ambrosiani omnes praeter alias fabulas Plutum quoque exhibeant, quod mihi sero innotuerunt, sane dolendum est"! Thiersch prints in his Addenda a brief description of these five manuscripts prepared by Hauthal.[5] Another important Milan manuscript was shortly to be laid under contribution by Dindorf. Thiersch collated Monacensis 492 afresh for his edition of the *Thesmophoriazusae* which appeared in 1832.

L. von Sinner, in his duodecimo edition of the *Nubes* (1834), calls attention to eight manuscripts in the Royal Library in Paris that contain the *Nubes* but had never been collated.[6] He thinks their collation would yield important results, but he declines to undertake the task himself.

[1] In his edition of the *Nubes*, p. x, Hermann had recourse to Seidler because he found Bekker's London edition carelessly printed.

[2] In his edition of the *Thesmophoriazusae*, p. ix.

[3] See *Classical Philology* I (1906), p. 7. [4] Pp. 257 ff.

[5] Pp. cdlxxxi f. The manuscripts were C 222, F 40, A 65, A 100, A 97.

[6] Cod. 2598, 2716, 2718, 2821, 2822, 2823, 2824, Supplem. 58.

Digitized by Google

W. Dindorf's *Annotationes* appeared at Oxford in 1837. For these he collated Vossianus 77,[1] whose readings had previously been quoted from Bentley's apograph with such corrections as Dobree had been able to publish in 1820,[2] and edited for the first time the readings of the *Lysistrata* in Laurentianus XXXI. 16 (Δ). It does not appear that Dindorf himself was ever in Italy.[3] In only two instances, so far as I can learn, does he state to whom he is indebted for new readings of the text in Italian manuscripts.[4] He is totally silent as to the sources of his information in regard to them in the preface to his *Annotationes*, yet he was the first to make known the contents of three Florentine books (Γ Δ Θ). In like manner his acknowledgment of the nature of his obligations for assistance in editing his *Scholia Graeca in Aristophanem ex codicibus aucta et emendata* (1838) is expressed in very vague terms.[5] There is no precise statement of the labors of Emmanuel Miller in his behalf, although they must have been serious.[6] Notwithstanding its inaccuracies, due to the tremendous pace at which Dindorf worked all his life long, the book marks an advance in our knowledge of the ancient commentary on Aristophanes. In editing the scholia Dindorf had at his command collations in whole or in part of six manuscripts: Ravennas, Veneti 474 and 475, Laurentiani XXXI. 15 and 2779, Ambrosianus L 39. The Ambrosianus was now brought into service for the first time.

The library of Trinity College, Cambridge, possesses collations of many manuscripts of Aristophanes that were made at different times by W. G. Clark, the accomplished editor of Shakspere. Clark's activity falls in the period just after 1850, but his work should be recorded. His critical skill was remarkable. In 1867 he had completed part of a commentary on the *Acharnians*, and this

[1] A fly-leaf in Leidensis 52 records that this manuscript had been sent to Leipzig for Dindorf's use in 1828.

[2] *Porsoni Notae*, Addenda p. (148).

[3] See I. v. Müller's *Biographisches Jahrbuch*, 1883, pp. 112 ff.

[4] Seidler and del Furia. See above, pp. 262 f.

[5] See the preface, p. xvii.

[6] "En 1835, Miller fut chargé d'une mission en Italie pour recueillir les scolies d'Aristophane." Salomon Reinach in I. v. Müller's *Biographisches Jahrbuch*, 1886, p. 15. Miller was at this time twenty-three years of age.

Digitized by Google

was subsequently published[1] just as it was left when he finally abandoned the work on which he had long been engaged. He had independently collated this play in the following manuscripts: Ambrosianus L 41; Barberinianus I 45; Estenses III D 8 and III D 14; Palatini 128 and 67; Ravennas; Laurentiani XXXI. 15 and 16; Parisini 2712, 2715 and 2717. The first five had never previously been used by any editor of Aristophanes. There are only two manuscripts in existence, besides the twelve he collated, that contain the *Acharnians*.[2] This, however, is simply an indication of Clark's range. His papers, now preserved in the library of Trinity College, show that he had made collations for all the eleven plays, and the extent to which he had single-handed laid the libraries of Europe under contribution was extraordinary when compared with the results of the labors of scholars who had preceded him. He had himself collated, in whole or in part, the following manuscripts, in addition to the twelve already named: Veneti 474 and 475, Urbinas 141, Vaticanus 1294, Palatinus 116, Ambrosianus L 39, Laurentiani XXXI. 4 and 13, LXXX. 26, XCI. 7, 66 (A F 2715), 140 (A F 2779), Monacenses 137 and 492.[3] Six of these had never previously been used by editors of the text of the comic poet. Scholars must feel poignant regret that Clark, because of ill-health, finally relinquished the edition of Aristophanes for which he had collected materials so ample and which he was so singularly well-fitted to write.

It appears from this brief summary that editors of Aristophanes have made recorded use of manuscripts, in establishing the text of the eleven plays, for about two hundred years. Their employment of symbols in referring to the manuscripts, to pass to my second topic, has not been consistent. The early editors, as was natural, used such designations as seemed good to them; their successors either disregarded these or made only partial use of them. The result is confusion.

[1] In the *Journal of Philology* VIII (1879), pp. 177 ff., and IX (1880), pp. 1 ff., 165 ff. Clark furnished von Velsen with a collation of the *Equites* in Parisinus 2712, which von Velsen used in his critical edition of this play (1869).

Havniensis 1980 and Vallicellianus F 16.

[3] Clark passed many of his vacations on the Continent. He collated the Ravennas for the first time in 1852.

Digitized by Google

Küster refers to the manuscripts he used either by unabbreviated titles or has Cod. Vat. U., Cod. Vat. (Vat. P.), Cod. Bodlej., Cod. Arund. (Arundell.), Cod. Voss. In his edition of the *Plutus* Hemsterhuis designates his two manuscripts as C. D'O. and C. LB. Trendelenburg has Cod. Elb. (Elbing.); Burgess, Ms. 43 and Ms. 127.[1]

Brunck was the first editor to use single capitals of the Roman alphabet to designate certain of his books, but with regrettable economy, although he had the whole alphabet at his command, he made the first three letters do service for four manuscripts. He styles Parisinus 2712 as A in his notes on the *Plutus*, *Nubes*, *Ranae*, *Equites*, *Aves*, *Acharnenses;* Parisinus 2715 as B on the *Equites*, *Aves*, *Acharnenses*, but as A on the *Vespae*, *Pax*, *Lysistrata;* Parisinus 2717 as C on the *Equites*, *Aves*, *Acharnenses*, but as B on the *Plutus*, *Nubes*, *Ranae*, *Vespae*, *Pax*, *Lysistrata;* his Regius Bombycinus[2] as C on the *Plutus*, *Nubes*, *Ranae*. His "Codex Meus" he designates as D. Of subsequent editors some have followed Brunck's intricate nomenclature, but the majority have designated each manuscript by a single letter, 2712 by A,[3] 2715 by B, 2717 by C,[4] the Regius Bombycinus and Brunck's own manuscript, on Dindorf's lead (1837), respectively by D and E.[5]

Thus at the start Brunck entailed confusion, but he must not be harshly judged by exasperated editors for his lack of foresight. He was not a modest man, as his preface makes manifest,[6] but

[1] See above, pp. 259 f. [2] See above, p. 260.

[3] Hermann identified Ernesti's R with Brunck's A, but nevertheless in the notes of both his editions of the *Nubes* he maintains the two designations of the manuscript, although he uses A more sparingly in the edition of 1830 than in that of 1799. Blaydes, in the Conspectus prefixed to his edition of the text (*Aristophanis comici quae supersunt opera*, 1886, pp. lxv ff.), proposes Par. 1 as the designation of Ernesti's R.

[4] Dindorf adopted A, B and C, in exclusive application to 2712, 2715, 2717 respectively, in 1837; previously he had followed Brunck, except in his edition of the *Ecclesiazusae* (1826), in which 2715 is D.

[5] Some editors have adopted new designations for these manuscripts. Thus 2712: Teuffel (1856) *a;* Rogers (1902) P; 2715: Thiersch (1830) G; Rogers (1867) P; Rogers (1902) P^1; 2717: Teuffel (1856) *b;* Rogers (1867) Π; Rogers (1902) P^2; "Regius Bombycinus": Teuffel (1856) *c;* Rogers (1902) P^3; "Codex Meus": Teuffel (1856) *d;* Rogers (1902) P^4.

[6] "Aristophanis quae ad hunc diem prodierunt editiones, si vel optimae omnium epigraphen quis inscripsisset, ΒΟΡΒΟΡΟΣ ΠΟΛΤΣ ΚΑΙ ΣΚΩΡ ΑΕΙ ΝΩΝ, haud sinistre facetissimi ipsius Comici verbis judicium animi significasse videretur. E tetra col-

Digitized by Google

notwithstanding his high opinion of his own performance, he can not have imagined that his edition would play so important a rôle as it was destined to have. Furthermore he lived in Strassburg in troublous times, was a public official, and worked in the midst of confessed distractions.[1]

The first use of the remaining capitals that occur in modern European alphabets may be briefly stated in tabular form. In each entry, other designations that have been used to denominate the manuscript to which the letter was appropriated are added after the dash. These designations, especially the early ones, were often followed by immediately subsequent editors.[2]

R Parisinus 2712, Ernesti-Hermann (1795, 1799, 1830).—Par. 1; A, *a*, P.

L Leidensis 34,[3] Ernesti-Hermann (1795, 1799, 1830).—Leid., *u*, Leid. 5; C. LB., Leid., Leid. 4.

E Parisinus 2820,[4] Höpfner (*Ranae*, 1797).—quartus Regius, F, *e*, P⁴.

F Cantabrigiensis 2627, Kidd (1817).—4 or Cant. 4, Dobraei quartus, Dobr. 4, *g*.

I Harleianus 5664, Kidd. (1817).—A, M, Harl., Harl. 1, H, L.

T Harleianus 6307, Kidd (1817).—6 or Harl. 6, H, Dobraei sextus, Ask., Harl., Harl. 3, Dobr. 6, *i*, L¹.

luvie vix tandem extractus, elegantiorum hominum in conspectum prodit totius antiquitatis scriptor ingeniosissimus, idemque tersi sermonis Attici exemplar perfectissimum, studio meo nitidior multo, quam erat antea, factus, nec tamen ita, ut eum esse vellem, ab omni sorde purgatus."

[1] He describes the painstaking care with which he constituted and twice copied his text with his own hand (see *Classical Philology* I, 1906, p. 2), and airily adverting to the mistakes a copyist is sure to make, adds: "nec hujus inconsiderantiae necesse duco ut me purgem, veniamque petam: quin mirari subit laetarique, bonam Fortunam frequentioribus istiusmodi lapsibus mihi cavisse, maxime quum recordor, partem haud minimam istarum fabularum a me descriptam iterum fuisse, dum in museo meo vel ludebat filius meus, quo animum meum nihil magis advertit oblectatque, vel confabulabantur boni quidam viri, qui quot fere diebus horisque matutinis ad me visere solent"! On this Porson, in his famous review of the book, remarks: "Tantamne rem tam negligenter? I think in such a case I should have sent Master Brunck out of the room. Pugh! says Mr. B. (or I suppose would say if he read Shakspeare) 'He talks to me that never had a son.' But to be serious: What right has a man to publish a work of this kind in a hurry?"

[2] Raper proposed in 1797 the following designations of manuscripts to be used in an edition which he was planning to publish: U for Küster's Urbinas, P for his Palatinus, B for his Bodleianus, A for his Arundelianus, V for his Vossianus, and O for the D'Orvillianus used by Hemsterhuis. Raper's book was never issued.

[3] I accept Dobree's identification of Ernesti's L. with the Leidensis used by Hemsterhuis. See above, p. 262.

[4] This was Brunck's sixth manuscript, used in his Addenda without literal designation.

Digitized by Google

P Vaticanus Palatinus 67, Dobree (1820).—Vat., Vat.-Pal., Vaticanus, *r*, Vat. P.

U Vaticanus Urbinas 141, Dobree (1820).[1]—Vat. U., Vaticanus, Vat., Urb., *q*.

V Vossianus 191,[2] Dobree (1820).—Vossianus, Leid. 6, Γ.

G Cantabrigiensis 2626, Dindorf (*Ranae*, 1824).—2 or Cant. 2, E, Dobraei secundus, Dobr. 2, *f*, C^1.

H Harleianus 6307, Dindorf (*Ranae*, 1824).—See above under T.

M Harleianus 5664, Dindorf (*Ranae*, 1824).—See above under I.

N Monacensis 492, Blaydes (1880).—Aug., G, H.

S Venetus 475, Blaydes (1882).—G, V^2.

W Vindobonensis 163, Blaydes (1886).—

Y Vindobonensis 210, Blaydes (1886).—W^1.

Z Vindobonensis 227, Blaydes (1886).—W^2.

O Baroccianus 127, Rogers (1902).—B., Bar. 3, E, Bodl. 1.

The symbols employed by the special editors of the prolegomena of Tzetzes *περὶ κωμῳδίας* are not included in this list nor in the list that follows.[3]

The confusion in existing practice is still more apparent, if one considers the different successive applications of each letter, as follows:

A Parisinus 2712, Parisinus 2715, Arundelianus, Harleianus 5664, Ravennas.

B Parisinus 2715, Parisinus 2717, Baroccianus 127, Venetus 474, Borgianus.

C Parisinus 2717, Brunck's "Bombycinus," Ernesti's "Coislianus," Cantabrigiensis 2614, Cantabrigiensis 2626.

D Brunck's "Meus," Cantabrigiensis 2626, Parisinus 2715, Brunck's "Bombycinus," D'Orvillianus.

E Parisinus 2820, Cantabrigiensis 2626, Brunck's "Meus," Baroccianus 127, Elbingensis.

[1] Höpfner (*Ranae*, 1797) proposes V. or U., but in his critical notes has Ms. V., Ms. Vat., Ms. Vat. V., Ms. Vatic. U., or the like.

[2] Now part of Leidensis 52.

[3] Four manuscripts besides manuscripts named in the list contain Tzetzian prolegomena, but nothing else that relates to Aristophanes, as follows:

OXFORD

Baroccianus 194 (B Kaibel) *S* ff. 91 ff.+ XV.

Miscellaneus 188 (B Cramer, M Kaibel) *S* ff. 285 ff.+ XVI.

PARIS

Parisinus 2403 (P Kaibel) *S* ff. 17 ff.+ XIII.

ROME

Vaticanus 1395 (V Studemund) *S* ff. 89–98+ XV.

Digitized by Google

F Cantabrigiensis 2627, Cantabrigiensis 2626, Parisinus 2827, Parisinus 2820, Laurentianus XXXI. 15.
G Cantabrigiensis 2626, Parisinus 2715, Venetus 475, Cantabrigiensis 2614, Monacensis 492, Parisinus 2827.
H Harleianus 6307, Harleianus 5725, Harleianus 5664, Monacensis 137, Monacensis 492.
I Harleianus 5664, Laurentianus 140 (AF 2779).
L Ernesti's Leidensis, Vossianus 77, Harleianus 5664.
M Harleianus 5664, Bekker's first Mutinensis, Ambrosianus L 39, Monacensis 137.
N Monacensis 492, Monacensis 137, Ambrosianus L 41.
O Baroccianus 127.
P Palatinus 67, Parisinus 2715, Palatinus 128, Parisinus 2712.
R Ernesti's Regius, Ravennas.
S Venetus 475.
T Harleianus 6307, Tubingensis, Venetus 472.
U Urbinas 141, Venetus 473.
V Vossianus 77, Vossianus 191, Venetus 474.
W Vindobonensis 163.
Y Vindobonensis 210.
Z Vindobonensis 227.

In the attempt to secure brief forms for use in repeated citation editors first resorted to self-interpreting abbreviations of the full names of the manuscripts. The adoption of capital letters was often a further application of the same principle, as Ernesti's R (Regius) and L (Leidensis), Dobree's P (Palatinus), U (Urbinas), and V (Vossianus); but Brunck, the first scholar to make use of capitals, applied them arbitrarily (A, B, C, D) and this has been the general practice. Some attempt was early made to designate manuscripts simply by Arabic numerals, as Porson 1 (Baroccianus 34) and 2 (Baroccianus 43), and Dobree 1, 2, 3, 4 (four Cantabrigienses), and 5, 6 (two Harleiani), but possible confusion of the numerals denoting the manuscripts with those designating the verses of the plays prevented this method from coming into vogue. At one time or another all capital letters of Roman source, except J, K, Q, and X, have been employed, but these proved to be insufficient and resort was had to capitals of the Greek alphabet. Some of these could not be used because of their similarity in form to Roman capitals: A,

Digitized by Google

B, E, Z, H,[1] I, K, M, N, O, P, T. Greek capitals have been employed as follows:

Γ[2] Laurentianus XXXI. 15, Dindorf (*Acharnenses*, 1828).—Laur., F.
Δ Laurentianus XXXI. 16, Dindorf (*Acharnenses*, 1828).—*k*, F[1].
Θ Laurentianus 140 (AF 2779), Dindorf (*Text Edition*, 1830).—I, F[6].
Π[3] Parisinus 2717, Rogers (*Pax*, 1867).—C, B, *b*, P[2].
Σ Laurentianus 607 (MN 88. 57), Blaydes (*Nubes*, 1873–74).—
Φ[4] Laurentianus 66 (AF 2715), Blaydes (*Nubes*, 1873–74),—F[4].
Χ Laurentianus XXXI. 13, Blaydes (*Nubes*, 1873–74).—F[3].
Ψ Laurentianus XXXI. 22, Blaydes (*Nubes*, 1873–74).—
Ω Laurentianus XXXI. 35,[5] Blaydes (*Nubes*, 1873–74)—F[2].
Υ (See note 3 below.)
Ξ Laurentianus XXXI. 19, Blaydes (*Plutus*, 1886).—

Scholars early became aware of the increasing confusion in the denomination of the manuscripts of Aristophanes. Dindorf gives practical evidence of this fact in the list he published in 1837,[6] in which he abandons some of his previous designations and starts afresh.[7] Teuffel, in his first edition of the *Nubes* (1856), offered a list of thirty-three manuscripts, to which he added the copy of the edition of Caninius, with marginal notes, now in Leyden.[8] He employed as symbols for these books the

[1] In his edition of the *Plutus* (1886) Blaydes drops into the use of H (which is sometimes printed H), but does not state here or elsewhere what this symbol signifies.

[2] Hall and Geldart in 1900 properly applied this symbol also to Leidensis 52. A. von Velsen first suggested that Laurentianus XXXI. 15 and Leidensis 52 were parts of the same manuscript. See *Ueber den Codex Urbinas der Lysistrata und der Thesmophoriazusen des Aristophanes* (1871), p. 53, and also Zacher, *Jarhrbücher für classische Philologie*, Supplem. XVI (1888), pp. 549 f., who adduces final proof.

[3] In the Conspectus of his edition of the text (1886), Blaydes assigns (p. lxx) Π to Laurentianus XXXI. 4 and Υ to Laurentianus XXXI. 19, but in the same Conspectus and elsewhere he denominates Laurentianus XXXI. 19 as Ξ. In his edition of the *Equites* published in 1875 he enters Υ simply as "Laurentianus XXXI," but in his voluminous critical notes on the play he has both Π and Υ, although Π is not entered in his "Catalogus Codicum." The same confusion is unhappily perpetuated in his edition of the *Equites* published in 1892.

[4] Employed by Rogers (*Vespae*, 1875) to designate Laurentianus XXXI. 16.

[5] By misprint this is designated in the "Catalogus Codicum" of the book as XXXI. 25.

[6] Ed. Oxoniensis III, pp. xiii–xvii. In IV, pp. iii ff. he gives an account of the manuscripts containing scholia. A fuller list of the latter was shortly published by Dübner, *Scholia Graeca in Aristophanem* (1841), pp. xi f.

[7] In his use of the Symbols A, B, C, D, E, F.

[8] See *Porsoni Notae in Aristophanem*, p. viii.

Digitized by Google

first nine capitals and all the lower-case letters,[1] except j, of the modern alphabet.[2] Only one of his assignments tallies with the previous practice of any editor.[3] It is fifty years since Teuffel proposed his new denominations, but no subsequent editor of Aristophanes has adopted them.

A similar attempt to introduce system into the general disorder has recently been made by B. B. Rogers in the new series of admirable verse-translations of Aristophanes which he began to publish in 1902.[4] In the appendices of the three volumes already issued he has employed thirty-three manuscripts. He has wisely left undisturbed four denominations, R, V, M, U, which may be regarded as fixed. The principle on which he has symbolized the remaining manuscripts is best stated in his own words:

> The letters by which the MSS. are designated vary in different editions of Aristophanes, and in none (except in the case of two or three of the principal MSS.) bear any relation to the MSS. themselves. I have therefore recast the nomenclature, denoting all the Venetian MSS. by the letter V, all the Parisian by P, all the Florentine by F, the Milanese by M, the Oxford by O, the Cambridge by C, the London by L, that of Modena by m, that of Monaco (formerly called Portus Herculis)[5] by H, the Viennese by W, the Elbing by E, and the Borgian by B, whilst I have retained the letters R and U for the Ravenna and the Vaticano-Urbinas respectively.

The veteran editor of Aristophanes, Blaydes, in his edition of the text (1886), published a complete list[6] of the manuscripts known to him and prefixed to them symbols. These manuscripts number more than ninety, including some used by early editors that have not yet been identified. Nineteen of them he designates by single capital letters of the modern alphabet, ten by Greek

[1] Bekker had previously used two lower-case letters, m and n, to denominate his second and third 'Mutinenses.'

[2] The list is repeated in his second edition (1863), pp. 22–24.

[3] F, assigned by Dindorf (*Ranae*, 1824) to Cantabrigiensis 2626, but afterwards attached by him to Parisinus 2820.

[4] He had previously published at long intervals translations into verse of the *Clouds*, *Peace*, *Wasps* and *Lysistrata*, which have long been out of print. In 1902 the *Frogs* and *Ecclesiazusae* appeared, in 1904 the *Thesmophoriazusae*.

[5] Mr. Rogers must relinquish this pleasing ascription. The two manuscripts (Monacenses 137 and 492) he designates by the single letter H are in Munich.

[6] See pp. lxv–lxxv.

Digitized by Google

capitals. The remainder are denominated by abbreviations consisting of three or four letters, to each of which is attached, with few exceptions, an Arabic numeral.[1]

It is highly desirable that scholars should agree, if possible, upon a method of symbolizing the manuscripts of Aristophanes adequate not only to denominate the two hundred and forty or more manuscripts that are now known but also to provide for any others that may be discovered. The determining principle is reasonably clear: so far as is practicable, the symbols chosen should be significant; they should each be of the smallest possible compass; they should be easy to distinguish even if ranged in order without spacing. No set of symbols, however, can ignore previous practice, and it may be well to consider this aspect of the problem first.

It is apparent that this practice is not uniform; on the contrary, it is so divergent that to trace the history of opinion about a passage is often perplexing and difficult. Nevertheless there are certain symbols, chiefly arbitrary, whose application may now be regarded as fixed: R, V, A, B, C, U,[2] Γ, Δ, Θ. To these should be added W, Y, Z, a recent set of symbols first applied by Blaydes to Vienna manuscripts, and also Ξ, Π,[3] Σ,[4] Φ, X, Ψ, Ω, assigned by him to Laurentian books. Blaydes has reported the contents, in whole or in part, of many manuscripts that had not previously been used, and no determination of symbols should be made that does not take his eleven monumental volumes into account. His reports are not always accurate, as was perhaps inevitable, and should be used with caution, but no editor is faultless and all students of the text of Aristophanes have substantial reasons for gratitude to this devoted scholar.[5] The indisputable fact is that

[1] Zuretti, in his *Analecta Aristophanea* (1892), in which he enumerates one hundred and nine manuscripts of Aristophanes housed in Italian libraries (pp. 3–33), adopts no system of symbols for reference.

[2] For Vaticanus-Urbinas 141 since Dobree's time. (Küster used Vat. U.) The practice of Blaydes is not consistent; he designates this manuscript as U, Urb., or Vat.; but in his editions of the *Plutus* and *Nubes*, U = Venetus 473.

[3] Π (=Υ) should be assigned to Laurentianus XXXI. 4. See above p. 271, n. 3.

[4] Blaydes has made only slight use of Σ.

[5] See the interesting preface to his edition of the text (1886), especially at the beginning and at the close.

Digitized by Google

they will have his volumes in hand, and the use of the manuscripts should not be further complicated by wilful disregard of his system of nomenclature in any attempt to devise a set of comprehensive symbols. Nevertheless there are other editors, and when Blaydes himself departs from established usage he should not be followed. For example, Dindorf long ago assigned G (Blaydes S) and M (Blaydes Med. 8) respectively to Venetus 475 and Ambrosianus L 39, and he has been followed by editors not only of the scholia but also of the text.[1] Of the remaining capitals, D, if used at all, should certainly designate Brunck's collation of his own manuscript ("Cod. Meus"). This *collation* is variously referred to in the editions as D (first by Brunck himself), E (first by Dindorf), *d*, P^5. The manuscript itself has never been used in editing the plays since Brunck's death, but it is now accessible among the Cambridge books and probably no editor will hereafter depend on Brunck's readings, made one hundred and twenty-five years ago. L should no longer be used for Leidensis 52, of which both parts legitimately claim the symbol Γ.[2] N is hopeless. Assigned by Blaydes in 1880 to Monacensis 492, a manuscript which von Velsen had denominated G in 1878,[3] it was applied by von Velsen in 1883 to Monacensis 137, which Blaydes had named M in 1873–74, and in 1901 was assigned by Neil to Ambrosianus L 41!

The abbreviations, generally consisting of three or four letters, that have been used to designate the manuscripts of Aristophanes have been self-interpreting. Sometimes they have referred to the libraries in which the manuscripts were housed, as Bodl., signifying Bodleianus, Laur., Laurentianus; oftener to the owner, especially in England, as Voss., Vossianus, Harl., Harleianus, Ar., Arundelianus, Bar., Baroccianus, D'Orv., D'Orvillianus, Borg., Borgianus; but generally to the town in which the library was

[1] Blaydes himself makes the same use of G and M as Dindorf in his lists of manuscripts containing the scholia, but elsewhere G represents Parisinus 2827 (for which in his Conspectus he proposes also Par. 14) and M is Monacensis 137, for which von Velsen in 1883 employed N. Only Graves has followed Blaydes in his use of S; nobody has adopted his Med. 8.

[2] See above, p. 271, n. 2.

[3] In his first edition of the *Thesmophoriazusae*.

Digitized by Google

situated, as Cant., Cantabrigiensis, Havn., Havniensis, Elb., Elbingensis, Leid., Leidensis, Med., Mediolanensis, Mut., Mutinensis, Monac. (Bav.), Monacensis (Bavaricus), Par., Parisinus, Rav., Ravennas, Urb., Urbinas, Tub., Tubingensis, Ven., Venetus. The method last named is easy to apply and the abbreviation is significant of a fact of prime importance. On this basis, setting aside the use of capitals, a general principle, which I have tentatively applied in the list of manuscripts of Aristophanes already published in this journal,[1] might be formulated as follows:

The symbol shall signify the name of the town in which the manuscript is preserved and shall consist of two letters, the initial capital and by preference the first consonant that follows, otherwise the first vowel.

Thus Br = Bruxelles, Ln = London, El = Elbing, Tb = Tübingen, Ld = Leyden, Np = Napoli, Md = Madrid, but Mu = München, Pa = Parma, Pe = Perugia, Mo = Moskva (Moscow).

The ultimate form is here the modern name of the town, whereas the abbreviations significant of place that early came into use were compendia of Latin adjective forms, Cantabrigiensis, Havniensis, and the like. The disagreement, however, is here apparent rather than real. There are forty places in which manuscripts of Aristophanes are now to be found. In case of twenty-five of these the application of the principle formulated above gives the same result, whether the basis is the modern or the Latin designation; two of the fifteen that remain disappear because of the use of single capitals; to eight others, that are relatively unimportant, no denomination has as yet been attached by the editors of Aristophanes; the remainder[2] will be considered below. The place, in a few instances, is not readily suggested by the abbreviation, under the rule, of the name now used by its inhabitants. The Danish name of Copenhagen is a case in point; furthermore, the German name of this city is not, in its first part, in literal agreement with the English, French and Italian forms. Here the adoption of H by reversion to 'Havniensis' reconciles all difficulties. Dindorf used Cod. Havniensis 1980 in 1822, and

[1] *Classical Philology* I (1906), pp. 9-20.

[2] Copenhagen, Cambridge, München, Firenze, Modena.

Digitized by Google

Blaydes has employed the abbreviation Havn.[1] Cn is applied to Stamboul on the same principle. The Greek name of Athens is naturally transliterated and J (not previously used) signifies Jerusalem. There are manuscripts also on Mt. Athos, Mt. Pelion, Mt. Sinai. These are designated by use of a capital and a small capital, respectively, as MA, MP, and MS.

The initial capital and the first following vowel have been used in the list as the abbreviation to designate the place in a few cases where the employment of capital and first consonant would give the same abbreviation for two names which both occur, as Parma (Pa) and Perugia (Pe), Caen (Ca) and Constantinople, München (Mu) and Montpellier; but Sa for Salamanca in order to avoid the concurrence of l and the following numeral 1.[2]

To the symbol, consisting of two letters or of a capital, employed to designate all the manuscripts housed in any one town numerals are added to distinguish the different books. Porson and Dobree applied this principle to Oxford, Cambridge, and London manuscripts. Blaydes also thus enumerates nine manuscripts in the Bodleian Library,[3] four in Cambridge,[4] three in London,[5] six in Leyden, ten in Milan, twenty-one in Paris. The numeral, since the practice is now settled of designating the different hands in a manuscript by a superior number, should be added on the level of the symbol, not above it. What the number attached to a particular manuscript shall be rests with the editor who first uses the book. In the list of manuscripts given above, a numeral has been added to each manuscript, with due attention

[1] This book contains nine plays and seems likely to play an important part in the determination of the sources of the Princeps. It was in Venice in 1699 and has an interesting history. See the references in Graux, *Notices sommaires des manuscrits grecs de la Grande Bibliothèque Royale de Copenhague* (1879), p. 68. See also above, p. 263.

[2] By an oversight, the wrong abbreviations of Torino and Verona have been given in the list; they should be respectively Tr and Vr.

[3] Blaydes, neglecting Porson's numbers, designates O1, O2, O3, O4, O6, O7, O8, O9, respectively as Bodl. 2, 3, 1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9. By Bodl. 5 he signifies "Bodleianus Kusteri."

[4] He uses Dobree's numbers.

[5] Blaydes, neglecting Dobree's numbers, denominates Ln3, Ln5, Ln6 respectively as Harl. 1, 2, 3.

Digitized by Google

to previous practice, but this enumeration is merely experimental; the majority of the books have not yet been used.[1]

The symbols suggested in the list in a few cases do not follow the general principle suggested and the reasons for some of these aberrations remain to be stated. In some instances they are only apparent. For example, the designation of the Paris books, under the rule, would be Pr (Blaydes Par.), but they are numerous and the adoption of the significant symbol P for them seems reasonable. P5, P8, and the remainder, are not likely to get confused with any previous use of the single letter P, although it has seen hard service. The symbols A, B, C, of three of the Paris manuscripts are fixed by the previous practice of editors. Of the remainder Blaydes first reported on twelve and to these he has attached numbers, which have been retained in the list so far as was possible.[2] In like manner, but with less ground for objection since the letter has escaped other use, O seems preferable to Ox for the Oxford books. Cm is the proper abbreviation under the rule to denominate the Cambridge manuscripts, but the abbreviations first used by Dobree for four of these (Cant. 1, Cant. 2, etc.) has become so firmly established that Ct seems preferable to Cm. Dobree's numbers have been retained.

Half the manuscripts of Aristophanes are in Italy, but with the exception of R, V, M, the Florence books, and four in the Vatican library, they have been little used. Ten of the Florence manuscripts are designated by Greek capitals; the remaining available Greek capitals would not suffice even for the Laurentian books that have not yet been denominated. Under the rule, manuscripts in Florence, both Laurentiani and Riccardiani, would be designated by Fr; in the list this has been abbreviated, with Rogers, to the significant F, and has been applied in this form to

[1] Eighty-five, if the count is correct, of the total number included in the list, have been used by editors, whether of the text, the scholia, or the prolegomena. These eighty-five include, of course, the most important manuscripts.

[2] Blaydes denominates P25 (Parisinus 2820) as both F and "Par. 8 bis;" P14 (Parisinus 2827) as both G and "Par. 14;" P23 (Parisinus 2830) as "Par. 16 bis;" P24 (Supplem. 97) as "Par. 18 bis." He has made very slight use of P10, P11, P12, P13, P15. He has attached numbers to P16 (his "Par. 16"), P18 ("Par. 18"), P21 ("Par. 21"), P23 ("Par. 16 bis"), but so far as I am aware has not reported them except "Par. 16" once. His last number is 21.

Digitized by Google

the books still undenominated. Blaydes has reported three Milan manuscripts besides M[1] and his numbers have been retained. In his Conspectus he assigns numbers to six others, but apparently he has not used these.[2] All the books in Modena await an editor, unless, indeed, Bekker's Mutinenses m and n are again in the Modena collection, although as yet unidentified. In the list the manuscripts in the Biblioteca Estense are denominated E on Kaibel's lead; Zuretti had previously used Es.[3]

Only four manuscripts of the great collections in the Vatican Library, a Vaticanus, two Palatini, and an Urbinas, have been used as yet by editors of the text.[4] The Vatican manuscripts are so numerous that their correct denomination is a matter of unusual importance. The six collections are kept separate in the library and this distinction should be maintained in symbolizing them. In the list V (Vaticanus) has been prefixed in each case to a significant lower-case letter designating the collection, with the exception of the two books originally in the library at Urbino.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

(To be continued)

[1] M4, M5, M9, which he denominates respectively Med. 4, Med. 5, Med. 9. M he denominates Med. 8.

[2] M1, M2, M3, M6, M7, M10, which he makes respectively Med. 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 10.

[3] Kaibel in his discussion of the prolegomena in *Comicorum Graecorum fragmenta* I (1899), pp. 3 ff.; Zuretti in his *Analecta Aristophanea*.

[4] Clark excepted. See above, pp. 265 f.

Digitized by Google

LIST OF MANUSCRIPTS[1]

BELGIUM

BRUSSELS

Bibliothèque Royale

4280–83 Pl. Nub. Ran. Arg. Schol. *S* ff. 118–221. + XV. Br1

11367 Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. Schol. *S* ff. 1–96. XV. Br2

11344 Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. *S* ff. 1–112. XV. Br3

DENMARK

COPENHAGEN

Royal Library

1980 (Havn.) Pl. Nub. Ran. Eq. Ach. Vesp. Av. Pax (1–947, 1012–1354, 1357), Lys. (1–61, 132–199, 268–819, 890–1097, 1237–end). Proleg. Arg. *S* ff. 1–318. XV. H

418 Pl. Schol. Gloss. ff. 1–42. XV. H2

ENGLAND

CAMBRIDGE

Library of the University of Cambridge

2626 Nn III 15 (Cant. 1) Pl. Nub. Ran. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 1–92. XV (Pl. Nub. 1–470), XIV (Nub. 500–end, Ran.). Ct1

2626 Nn III 15 (Cant. 2) Pl. Nub. Ran. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 1–151. XV. (Bound with the foregoing.) Ct2

2614 Nn III 3 (Cant. 3) Pl. Nub. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 1–83. XV. Ct3

2627 Nn III 16 (Cant. 4) Pl. Nub. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 1–144. + XV. Ct4

SUPPLEMENTARY

696 Dd XI 70 Arg. Schol. Metres to Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. *S* ff. 25–80 + XVI. Ct5

Library of Trinity College

459 R. 1. 42 (D Brunck=E Dindorf) Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. —Rare Schol. Gloss. on Pl. *S* ff. 1–194. XV. ("Brunck's Aristophanes.") Ct6

984 R. 16. 36 (Voss. Küster=Trin. Dobree) Lys. Av. (1492–1523). Schol. *M* ff. 1–54. XVII. XVIII. (Bentley's copy of Cod. Vossianus 77.) Ct7

LONDON

British Museum

Harleianus 6307 (Harl. 6 Dobree) Pl. Nub. Ran. Arg. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 1–181. XV. Ln6

[1] So far as possible, each entry includes: *Shelf-mark; Contents; Size;* (*S* = cm. 1–27, —*M* cm. 28–37, L = cm. 38 +); *Number of Folios* (+ signifies that the manuscript has other contents); *Age; Symbol* (actual, in parentheses after the shelf-mark; suggested, at the end).

Digitized by Google

Harleianus 5629 Nub. (291–342). *S* + XV. Ln2

Harleianus 5664 (A Porson) Pl. (235–end), Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 71–238. XV. Ln3

Harleianus 5725 (Harl. 5 Dobree) Pl. (266–end), Nub. Schol. —Arg. to Nub. and also Ran. *S* ff. 1–139. XV. Ln5

Additions 12182 Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 1–143. XV. Ln4

Arundelianus 530 (Ar. Dobree) Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. *S* ff. 1–103. XV. Ln1

Harleianus 1675 Pl. Gloss. *S* ff. 54–74. + XVI (1591). Ln7

OXFORD

Bodleian Library

Baroccianus 127 (B Porson) Pl. (561–end), Nub. Ran. (1–1384). Schol. Gloss. on Pl.—Arg. Schol. (rare) on Nub. Ran. *S* ff. 1–88. XIII. O3

Baroccianus 34 (1 Porson) Pl. Proleg. Arg. Gloss. *S* ff. 59–143. + XV. O1

Baroccianus 43 (2 Porson) Pl. (1–124, 349–end), Nub. (1–379, 546–end). Schol. Gloss. on Pl.—Schol. on Nub.—Arg. to Ran. *S* ff. 1–145. XV. O2

D'Orvillianus 72 (*X. 1. 3. 13*) (Dorv. Dobree) Pl. Nub. Schol. *S* ff. 1–94. + XV (1441). O4

Canonicianus 40 (Bodl. 6 Blaydes) Pl. (defective), Nub. Proleg. Arg. Schol.—Gloss. on Pl. *S* ff. 1–126. + XV. O6

Canonicianus 46 (Bodl. 7 Blaydes) Pl. Nub. Arg. *S* ff. 1–110. XV. O7

Miscellaneus 246 (Bodl. 9 Blaydes) Pl. (1–773). Gloss. *S* ff. 1–41. XV. O9

Miscellaneus 150 (Bodl. 8 Blaydes) Pl. Nub. *S* ff. 1–101. XVI. O8

SUPPLEMENTARY

Baroccianus 38 (Bar. Dübner) Schol. on Lys. Arg. *S* ff. 63–84. + XV. O10

Miscellaneus 101. Schol. on Lys. Arg. *S* ff. 1–16. XVIII. (Copy of the foregoing.) O11

Library of Lincoln College

X. 1. (probably Küster's Bodl.) Pl. Arg. Schol. *S* ff. 1–39. XVII. O12

FRANCE

AGEN

Bibliothèque d'Agen

20 Pl. Proleg. *S* ff. 93–163. + XVI. Ag

Digitized by Google

CAEN

Bibliothèque de Caen

SUPPLEMENTARY

451 Schol. on Lys. Arg. *S* ff. 1-21. XVII. (Copy of Baroccianus 38, ff. 63-84.) Ca

MONTPELLIER

Bibliothèque de Montpellier

SUPPLEMENTARY

337 Schol. on Pl. Nub. Ran. *S* ff. 1-138. XVI. Mn

PARIS

Musée du Louvre

Parchemins Av. (1057-1085, 1101-1127). Schol. VI. (Fragment, written in uncials, found in the Fayûm.)

Bibliothèque Nationale

2712 (A) Pl.Nub. Ran. Eq. Av. Ach. Ec. (1-282). Proleg. Arg.—Schol. Gloss. on Nub. Ran. (1-186). *M* pp. (not ff.) 107-110, 213-224, 227-230. + XIII. A

2820 (F Dindorf) Pl. (defective), Nub. (defective), Ran. Arg.—Schol. on Ran. *S* ff. 1-40, 51-88. XIV. P25

Supplement 135 (C Brunck = D Dindorf) Pl. Nub. Ran. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 1-235. XIV. P19

Supplement 463 Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Schol. *S* ff. 1-118. XIV. P20

Supplement 655 Pl. Proleg. Schol. *M* ff. 1-29. + XIV. P22

2821 (Par. 8 Blaydes=Q Studemund) Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 1-108. XIV. P8

2598 Pl. Nub. Gloss. *S* ff. 25-123. + XV. P5

2822 (Par. 9 Blaydes) Pl. Nub. Ran. *S* ff. 1-165. XV. P9

Coislin 354 (probably C Ernesti-Hermann) Pl. Nub. Proleg. *S* ff. 1-92. XV. P2

2827 (G Blaydes=Par. Dübner) Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. Schol. *S* ff. 11-99. + XV. P14

2716 (Par. 6 Blaydes) Eq. Nub. Ran. *S* ff. 1-107. XV. XVI. P6

2718 Pl. Nub. *M* ff. 17-86. + XV. XVI. P7

2902 Pl. Nub. Proleg. Schol. *S* ff. 27-118. + XV. XVI. P17

2715 (B) Eq. Ach. Av. Vesp. Lys. (1-61, 132-199, 268-819, 890-1097, 1237-end), Ec. (1-1135), Pax (1-947, 1012-1300). *M* ff. 1-219. XVI. B

2717 (C) Eq. Ach. Vesp. Pl. Nub. Ran. Av. Pax (1-947, 1012-1354, 1357), Lys. (1-61, 132-199, 268-819, 890-1097, 1237-end). Proleg. Arg.—Schol. Gloss. on Pl.(1-381). Occasional Schol. Gloss. elsewhere. *M* ff. 1-480. XVI. C

2823 Pl. Nub. Proleg. Schol. *S* ff. 1-119. + XVI. P10

Digitized by Google

2824 Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Schol. *S* ff. 1–128. + XVI. P11
2825 Pl. (defective), Nub. *S* ff. 1–40. XVI. P12
2826 Pl. Nub. Proleg. *S* ff. 1–105. XVI. P13
2828 Pl. Nub. *S* ff. 1–122. + XVI. P15
2829 Pl. *S* ff. 1–48. + XVI. P16
2830 Pl. Schol. *S* ff. 1–76. XVI (1515). P23
Supplement 58 Pl. Nub. (defective). *S* ff. 1–15. + XVI. P18
Supplement 97 Pl. Nub. Schol. *S* ff. 1–126. + XVI. P24
Supplement 499 Pl. Nub. *S* ff. 1–51. XVIII. P21

SUPPLEMENTARY

985 Extract from Pl. *S* ff. 1–3. XV. P26
Supplement 1247 Sententiae Pl. Nub. Proleg. *M* ff. 35–146. XVI. P27
Supplement 395 "Scholia et castigationes in Aristophanis comoedias." *M* ff. 1–173. XVII. P28
2644 Tzetzes *De comoedia*. *S* ff. 233–234. + XIV. P29
2677 Tzetzes *De comoedia*. *M* ff. 92–94. + XVI. P30

GERMANY AND AUSTRIA

ELBING

Stadtbibliothek

Cod. Elbingensis (Elb.) Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. + El

HAMBURG

Stadtbibliothek

SUPPLEMENTARY

40 Schol. on Lys. Arg. *M* ff. 108–111. + XVII. (Copy of Barocc ianus 38) Hm.

MUNICH

Königliche Hof- und Staatsbibliothek

137 (N von Velsen=M Blaydes) Pl. Nub. Ran. Ec. Proleg. Arg. *M* ff. 1–105. + XV. Mu1
492 (G von Velsen=N Blaydes) Thesm. Lys. Arg. to Lys. *S* ff. 1–39. + XV. Mu2
89 Nub. (1–188). ff. 103–120. + XV. Mu3
533 Pl. (1–203). ff. 23–26. + XV. XVI. Mu4

SUPPLEMENTARY

182 Arg. to Ach. Eq.—Collectanea of Politian on Ach. Eq. ff. 90–106. + XV. Mu5

TÜBINGEN

Universitätsbibliothek

Mb 32 (Tub.) Pl. Nub. (1–144) ff. 1–156. XV. Tb

Digitized by Google

VIENNA

Hofbibliothek

XCV Pl. (the opening verses). f. 134. + W2
CLXIII (W Blaydes) Pl. Nub. Ran. (1–675). Schol. W
CXCIII Pl. Nub. Rare Schol. ff. 1–105. W3
CCIV Pl. Nub. ff. 1–110. W4
CCX (Y Blaydes) Pl. Nub. Ran. Schol. Gloss. ff. 1–155. Y
CCXIX Pl. Nub. Schol. Gloss. + W5
CCXXVII (Z Blaydes) Pl. Nub. Ran. ff. 1–141. Z
CCXLIX Pl. Nub. ff. 1–112. W6
CCLVII Pl. Nub. + W7

SUPPLEMENTARY

CCLXXXIX Extracts from the comedies. + W8

GREECE

ATHENS

Ἐθνικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη

1062 Pl. Nub. Schol. Gloss on Pl. *S* + XVI. At1
1063 Pl. Gloss. *S* + XVII (1628). At2
1131 Pl. Nub. *S* + XVIII. At3
1133 Pl. *S* + XVIII (1740). At4

MOUNT PELION (MELIAE)

SUPPLEMENTARY

88 Ἀριστοφάνους Ἐξήγησις τῆς δευτέρας κωμῳδίας. *S* ff. 143–153. + XVIII. Mp

HOLLAND

LEEUWARDEN

Library of the Province of Friesland

34 Pl. Nub. Proleg.—Schol. on Nub. *S* ff. 1–94. + XVI. Lw

LEYDEN

University Library

52 (*Cod. Vossianus* 77) (Voss. Dindorf=L Dübner) Lys. (1–61, 132–199, 268–819, 890–1034). Schol. Gloss. *M* ff. 1–11. XIV. Γ
52 (*Cod. Vossianus 191*) (V Dobree) Av. (1492–1765). Schol. Gloss. *M* ff. 12–15. XIV. (Now bound with the foregoing. See Cod. Laur. XXXI. 15.) Γ
34 (*XVIII. 61. C*) (C. LB Hemsterhuis=L Ernesti-Hermann) Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 1–125. XV. Ld4

SUPPLEMENTARY

23 (*Cod. Vossianus*) Schol. on Lys. ff. 1–13. Ld7
35 (*XVIII. 74. D*) Schol. on Lys. *S* ff. 1–38. Ld8

Digitized by Google

ITALY

BOLOGNA

Biblioteca dell' Università

1766 Pl. *S* ff. 60–106. + XVI. Bl

CREMONA

Biblioteca Governativa

171 Pl. Nub. Ran. Arg. Schol. *S* ff. 1–144. XIV. XV. Cr

FERRARA

Biblioteca Comunale

113 Pl. (*bis*), Nub. (*bis*). Proleg. Arg. Schol. *S* ff. 1–223. XV (1419). Fr1

247 Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg.—Rare Schol. on Pl.—Rare Gloss. on Pl. and Nub. *S* ff. 102–292. + XV. Fr2

253 Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. *S* ff. 1–98. + XV. Fr3

FLORENCE

Biblioteca Mediceo-Laurenziana

LX. 9 Av. (1393–1453). Schol. X. (Palimpsest fragment. See *Hermes* XXVI (1891), pp. 128–136.)

XXXI. 15 (Γ) Ach. Ec. Eq. Av. (1–1419), Vesp. (421–1396, 1494–end), Pax (378–490, 548–837, 893–947, 1012–1126, 1190–1300). Arg. Schol. Gloss. *M* ff. 67–162. + XIV. Γ

XXXI. 13 (Χ Blaydes) Pl. Nub. Ran. Eq. Arg. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 1–124. XIV. Χ

XXXI. 22 (Ψ Blaydes) Nub. Arg. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 1–50. XIV. Ψ

66 (*AF 2715*) (Φ Blaydes) Pl. Nub. Ran. Arg. *S* ff. 1–89. + XIV. Φ

140 (*AF 2779*) (Θ) Pl. Nub. Eq. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Schol. *S* ff. 1–185. XIV. Θ

XXXI. 16 (Δ) Pl. Nub. Eq. Ran. Ach. Av. Vesp. Lys. (1–61, 132–199, 268–819, 890–1097, 1237–end). Arg. *S* ff. 1–259. XV. Δ

XXXI. 4 Pl. Nub. Ran. Eq. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 1–191. XV. Π

XXXI. 19 (Ξ Blaydes) Pl. *S* ff. 1–46. XV. Ξ

LXXX. 26 Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 13–180.+ XV. F1

XXXI. 36. Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 1–106. XV. F2

XCI. 7 Pl. Nub. Eq. Ran. Proleg. Arg.—Rare Schol. on Nub. *S* ff. 1–167. XV (1485). F3

97 (*AF 2714*) Nub. Gloss. *S* ff. 34–85. + XV. F4

607 (*MN 88. 57*) (Σ Blaydes) Pl. Nub. Arg. to Nub. *S* ff. 1–104. XV. Σ

Digitized by Google

XXXI. 35 (Q Blaydes) Pl. Nub. Ran. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 1–146. XV. XVI. Q

83 (*AF 2662*) Pl. (1–192). *M* ff. 34–61. + XVI. F5

SUPPLEMENTARY

164 (*C 323*) Sententiae. *M* A few ff. + XVI. F6

Biblioteca Riccardiana

36 (*K. II. 22*) Pl. Nub. Eq. Ran. Arg. to Nub. *M* ff. 1–116. + XV. F8

48 (*K. II. 23 and 24*) Ran. Pl. Schol. Gloss. to Pl. ff. 1–80, 81–108. XVI and XV. (Two manuscripts in one.) F9

57 (*S. II. 29*) Nub. (defective). *S* ff. 1–32. + XVI. F10

61 Pl. (1–11, 51–500). *S* ff. 1–29. XVI. F11

SUPPLEMENTARY

78 Extracts (Pl. 146, 1151). *S* f. 68. + XV. F12

22 (*K. I. 26*) Extract (Pl. 200, 201). *M* Fly-leaf. + XVI. F13

MILAN

Biblioteca Ambrosiana

C 222 inf. (Med. 4 Blaydes) Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Schol. —Arg. to Eq. Av. *M* ff. 43–108. + XIII. M4

L 39 sup. (M) Pl. Nub. Eq. Av. (1–1641). Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 89–231. + XIV. M

L 41 sup. (Med. 9 Blaydes=N Neil) Pl. Nub. Ran. Eq. Av. Ach. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 1–285. XV. M9

D 64 sup. (Med. 5 Blaydes) Pl. Nub. Ran. Eq. Proleg. Arg. *S* ff. 1–125. XV. M5

F 40 sup. Pl. Nub. Ran. Eq. Proleg. Arg. Schol. ff. 19–208. + XV. M11

A 65 sup. (Med. 1 Blaydes) Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. Gloss. *S* XV. M1

A 100 sup. (Med. 3 Blaydes) Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. *S* ff. 1–98. XV. M3

O 72 sup. (Med. 10 Blaydes) Pl. Nub. (752–1055). Rare Schol. Gloss. ff. 61–82. + XV. M10

A 97 sup. (Med. 2 Blaydes) Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. *S* XVI. M2

I 109 inf. (Med. 7 Blaydes) Pl. Schol. *M* ff. 1–101. XVI. XVII. M7

SUPPLEMENTARY

Z 165 sup. Eclogae Pl. Nub. Ran. Eq. Ach. Av. *S* ff. 1–32. XV. M12

F 30 sup. Num. 2. (Med. 6 Blaydes) Schol. on Lys. Arg. *S* + XV. M6

Digitized by Google

MODENA

Biblioteca Estense

III D 8 Pl. Nub. Ran. Eq. Av. (1–220, 662–end), Ach. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 1–230. XV. E

III D 14 Ran. Eq. Av. Ach. Arg. Schol. (rare), Gloss. *S* ff. 1–235. XV. E2

III B 1 Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 1–136. XV. E3

III A 14 Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 1–98. XV. E4

III A 3 Pl. (218–end), Nub. Arg. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 1–69. XV. E5

III A 13 Pl. Nub. (50–end). Schol. (rare), Gloss. *S* ff. 1–114. XV. E6

SUPPLEMENTARY

III C 14 Schol. on Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Metra. *S* ff. 19–80, 99–112. + XV. E7

III A 17 Schol. on Pl. Nub. (1–240). Proleg. Arg. *S* ff. 29–91. + XV. E8

NAPLES

Biblioteca Nazionale

179 (*II F 22*) Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 1–77, 83, 84. + XIV. Np1

184 (*II F 27*) Pl Nub. Proleg. Arg. *S* ff. 1–60. XIV. Np2

180 (*II F 23*) Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Schol. *S* ff. 29–183. + XV. Np3

181 (*II F 24*) Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg.—Schol. (rare) on Pl. *S* ff. 1–137. XV (1485). Np4

182 (*II F 25*) Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 1–160. XV. Np5

183 (*II F 26*) Pl. Proleg. Arg. Gloss. *S* ff. 1–42. XV. Np6

PARMA

Biblioteca Palatina

260 Pl. (1–647). Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 43–66. + XV. XVI. Pa

PERUGIA

Biblioteca Comunale

H 56 Ran. Ec. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 1–88. + XV. Pe1

I 106 Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 1–63. XV (1473). Pe2

SUPPLEMENTARY

I 62 Sententiae. *S* ff. 76, 77. + XV. Pe3

RAVENNA

Biblioteca Classense

137, 4, A (R) Pl. Nub. Ran. Av. Eq. Pax. Lys. Ach. Vesp. Thesm. Ec. Arg. Schol. Gloss. *M* ff. 1–191. XI. R

Digitized by Google

ROME

Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana

Codices Vaticani

920 Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 1 sq. + XIII. XIV. Vv1

57 Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 25 sq. + XIV. Vv2

61 Nub. (1410–end), Ran. Arg. Schol. ff. 1 sq. + XIV. Vv3

918 Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. ff. 1–160. XIV (1362). Vv4

1294 (Vat. Zacher) Pl. Nub. Ran. Eq. (1–270). Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. *M* ff. 1–111. + XIV. Vv5

59 Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. ff. 1–107. + XV. Vv6

60 Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. ff. 1 sq. XV. Vv7

917 Pl. Nub. Ran. Arg. Schol. Gloss. ff. 1–177. XV. Vv8

919 Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. ff. 1–167. XV. Vv9

921 Pl. Ran. Arg. Gloss. ff. 1–107. XV. Vv10

1371 Pl. Arg. ff. 126–162. + XV. Vv11

1378 Ran. Arg. Schol. ff. 150 sq. + XV. Vv12

35 Ran. Schol. ff. 253 sq. + XV. Vv13

37 Pl. Nub. Schol. Gloss. ff. 192 sq. + Vv14

SUPPLEMENTARY

1463 Schol. on Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. ff. 81–102. + XV. Vv15

62 Tzetzes *De comoedia.* ff. 108 sq. + XVI. Vv16

Codices Barberiniani

I 45 Ach. Ec. (1–1135), Eq. Arg. Rare Gloss. *S* ff. 1–95, 100–158. XV. Vb1

I 46 Pl. Nub. Eq. Ran. Proleg. Arg. ff. 1–139. XV. Vb2

I 126 Pl. Nub. Ran. Arg. Schol. ff. 1–73. XV. Vb3

I 148 Pl. (1–60). Gloss. ff. 1–7. XVI. Vb4

I 77 Pl. ff. 1–28. XVII. Vb5

I 110 Pl. ff. 1–40. + XVII. Vb6

SUPPLEMENTARY

I 4 Sententiae Pl. Nub. Ran. ff. 49–54. + XV. Vb7

Codices Palatini

116 Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 23–140. + XIV. Vp1

67 (P Müller=Vat. Küster) Pl. Nub. Ran. Eq. Ach. Vesp. Av. Pax. (1–947, 1012–1354, 1357), Lys. (1–61, 132–199, 268–819, 890–1097, 1237–end). Arg.—Rare Schol. Gloss. on Eq. Ach. (1–102). *M* ff. 1–234. XV. Vp2

128 (P von Velsen, Zacher) Eq. Ach. Vesp. Arg. to Ach. Vesp. Aves. *S* ff. 91–185. + XV. Vp3

Digitized by Google

240 Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. Gloss. Rare Schol. *S* ff. 1–104. XV. Vp4
289 Pl. Nub. *S* ff. 1–85, 41–84. XV. Vp5
293 Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. *M* ff. 16–82. + XV. Vp6
321 Pl. *M* ff. 1–47. XV. Vp7
324 Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. *M* ff. 1–98. + XV. Vp8
363 Pl. ff. 317–320. + XV. Vp9
223 Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 8–188. + XV (1495). Vp10
319 Pl. (1–285, 594–961), Ran. (703–1195), Eq. (640–1205), Nub. (823–1106). *M* ff. 53–94. XV. XVI. Vp11

Codices Ottoboniani

166 Pl. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 5–34. + XV. Vo1
161 Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. *S* ff. 1–146. XV. XVI. Vo2
181 Pl. Nub. Proleg.—Arg. to Nub.—Rare Schol. Gloss. on Pl. *S* ff. 5–82. + XVI. Vo3
210 Pl. Nub. (1–1466). *S* ff. 168–274. + XVI. Vo4
346 Pl. Nub. Proleg.—Arg. to Nub. *S* ff. 1–70. + XVI. Vo5
385 Pl. *S* ff. 1–13. + XVI. Vo6
307 Pl. *S* ff. 1–50. + XVII. Vo7

Codices Urbinates

141 (U) (Vat. U Küster) Pl. Nub. Ran. Av. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 78–190. + XIV. U
143 Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 1–141. XIV. XV. U2

Codices Reginae Suecorum

147 Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 1–100. + XIV. Vs1
161 Pl. Proleg. Arg. *S* ff. 1–32. XV. Vs2

SUPPLEMENTARY

142 A few sententiae on a folio preceding the MS. *S* XVI. Vs3

Biblioteca Vallicelliana

F 16 Ach. (691–930). Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 53–60. + XV. Rm1
F 25 Pl. (1–80, 82–207). Gloss. ff. 64–70. + XVI. Rm2

SUPPLEMENTARY

E 21 Florilegium. A few extracts. + XVI. Rm3

Archivio di San Pietro

C 152 Pl. (206–end), Nub. Schol. Gloss. *S* + XVII (1620). Rm4

TURIN

Biblioteca Nazionale

B VI 18 (36) Pl. Rare Gloss. *S* ff. 1–51. + XV. XVI. Tr1

SUPPLEMENTARY

B V 33 Extracts from Pl. Nub. Ran. ff. 284–286. + Tr2

Digitized by Google

B V 34 Extracts from Schol. on Eq. Pl. Nub. Ran. Av. Vesp. Proleg.—Arg. to Ran. *S* ff. 90–93, 98–123, 136–137, 146–156. + XVI. Tr3

VENICE

Biblioteca Nazionale di S. Marco

474 (V) Pl. Nub. Ran. Eq. Av. Pax, Vesp. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. *M* ff. 1–172. XII. V

472 (T Blaydes) Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 1–91. + XIV. V2

473 (U Pl. Nub. Blaydes) Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 1–81. XIV. V3

Supplem. XIV (*Cl. IX*) Pl. Nub. (24–end). Proleg. Arg. Schol. *S* ff. 40–149. XIV. V4

475 (G, but S or G Blaydes) Pl. Nub. Ran. Eq. Av. Pax, Vesp. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. *P* ff. 1–153. + XV. (Copy of 474) G

Append. 613 Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. ff. 1–103. XVI. V5

Supplem. XXVI (*Cl. IX*) Pl. (392–end), Nub. (1–1341), Ran. (78–1167). Arg. to Nub.—Schol. Gloss. ff. 1–106. V6

VERONA

Biblioteca Capitolare

CXXXI (*120*) Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 1–131. XV. Vr

RUSSIA

Moscow

Library of the Holy Synod

311 (*298 Matthaei*) Pl. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 76–136. + XVII. Mo1

238 (*225 Matthaei*) Ran. Arg. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 1–56. + XVII. Mo2

SPAIN

ESCURIAL

Biblioteca del Escorial

Φ *III 6* Pl. Nub. Ran. Arg. Gloss. ff. 1–112. XV. Es1

Υ *III 16* Pl. Nub. Ran. Schol. ff. 1–196. XV. Es2

Ω *IV 7* Ran. Gloss. ff. 104–165. + XV. Es3

SUPPLEMENTARY

X *I 13.* Extracts Pl. Nub. Ran. ff. 317–319, 328. + XIV. Es4

MADRID

Biblioteca Nacional

N 53 Pl. Nub. Ran. Eq. (1–308). Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 1–85. + XIV. XV. Md1

N 47 Pl. *S* ff. 187–205. + XV. Md2

Digitized by Google

SUPPLEMENTARY

N 72 Sententiae. *S* + XV. Md3
N 67 Proleg. Arg.—Schol. on Pl. Nub. *S* ff. 21–34, 36–43. + XV. Md4

SALAMANCA

Biblioteca de la Universidad

1-2-5 Nub. Ran. Pl. (1–30, 253–end). + XVI. Sa1
1-2-14 Pl. Nub. Ran. (1–607). Arg. to Nub. Ran. ff. 1–139. XVI. Sa2
1-2-10 Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. + XVI. Sa3

TURKEY

ATHOS (MOUNT ATHOS)

Βιβλιοθήκη τῆς Μονῆς Ξηροποτάμου

93 Nub. (defective). Gloss. *S* + XVI. MA1

Βιβλιοθήκη τῆς Μονῆς Ἰβήρων

144 Pl. (317–end), Nub. (1–1316). Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 1–98. XV. MA2

SUPPLEMENTARY

1317 Arg. *S* + XVIII. MA3

Βιβλιοθήκη τῆς Μονῆς Καρακάλλου

62 Pl. Nub. *S* + XVIII. MA4

Βιβλιοθήκη τῆς Μονῆς Γρηγορίου

101 Pl. (defective). *S* + XVII. MA5

CONSTANTINOPLE

Βιβλιοθήκη τοῦ ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει Μετοχίου τοῦ Παναγίου Τάφου

143 Pl. Schol. *S* ff. 403–438. + XVII. Cn

JERUSALEM

Ἱεροσολυμιτικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη

II 424 Nub. ff. 1–43. + XVII. J1
I 394 Pl. *S* + XVII. XVIII. J2
II 462 Pl. ff. 330–356. + XVIII (1732). J3
II 463 Nub. + XVIII. J4

MOUNT SINAI

Library of the Monastery

1206 Ran. (1–822). Arg. *S* + XV. Ms

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google